


167. LINCOLN. Life of Abraham Lincoln, with a Condensed View of his most important Speeches; also a Sketch of the Life of Hannibal Hamlin. By J. H. Barrett. *With portraits.* 12mo, cloth. Cinn. 1860

Very scarce.

LINCOLN ROOM

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY



MEMORIAL

the Class of 1901

founded by

HARLAN HOYT HORNER

and

HENRIETTA CALHOUN HORNER



2011



Madill & Co., Engravers & Co.

*Yours truly
A. Lincoln*

BARRETT'S AUTHENTIC EDITION.

L I F E

OF

ABRAHAM LINCOLN,

(OF ILLINOIS.)

WITH A CONDENSED VIEW OF HIS MOST
IMPORTANT SPEECHES;

ALSO

A SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF

HANNIBAL HAMLIN

(OF MAINE.)

BY J. H. BARRETT.

CINCINNATI:
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.
25 WEST FOURTH STREET,
1860.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1860, by
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for
the Southern District of Ohio.

PREFACE.

IN thankfully acknowledging the readiness with which all reasonable facilities have been afforded for obtaining authentic materials to be used in the production of this work, the writer owes it to Mr. LINCOLN and to Mr. HAMLIN, as well as to their immediate friends, to say that he expressly disclaims any authority to speak in their name. He alone is responsible for whatever statements and opinions appear in these pages, not otherwise distinctly credited.

The sketch of Mr. HAMLIN's life has necessarily been compressed into smaller compass than was desired, to the exclusion of portions of his more important speeches, which would else have been given; yet it presents a complete and accurate view, in outline, of the eventful career of this distinguished statesman.

J. H. B.

{ GAZETTE OFFICE,
{ Cincinnati, June 18, 1860.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary Remarks—Ancestry of Abraham Lincoln—Their Residence in Pennsylvania and Virginia—His Grandfather Crosses the Alleghanies to join Boone and his Associates—"The Dark and Bloody Ground"—His Violent Death—His Widow Settles in Washington county—Thomas Lincoln, his Son, Marries and Locates near Hodgenville—Birth of Abraham Lincoln—LaRue county—His Early Life and Training in Kentucky 9

CHAPTER II

The Removal from Kentucky—An Emigrant Journey—The Forests of Southern Indiana—New Home of the Lincoln Family—Indiana in 1816—Slavery and Free Labor—Young Lincoln at His Work—His Schools and Schoolmasters—Self-Education—A Characteristic Incident—Acquaintance with River Life—His First Trip to New Orleans as a Flatboatman—Death of His Mother—His Father's Second Marriage—Recollections of an Early Settler—Close of an Eventful Period in Young Lincoln's History 21

CHAPTER III.

The French Settlements—The North-West—The Advance of Emigration—Four Great States Founded in the Lifetime of Mr. Lincoln's Father—North and South Meeting in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—Sentiments of Southern Emigrants—The First Emigrations—A Coincidence of Dates—Mordecai and Josiah Lincoln—Removal to Illinois—Settlement on the Sangamon, in Macon county—The Locality Described—Abraham Lincoln Splits Three Thousand Rails—Another Removal of His Father—They Separate—His Father Spends the rest of his Days in Coles county—Abraham Lincoln makes Another Trip as a Flatboatman—Becomes Clerk in a Store on his Return—Leaves the Business after a Year's Service. 30

CHAPTER IV.

Breaking Out of the Black Hawk War—The Invasion of 1831—The Rock-river Country Threatened—Prompt Action of Gov. Reynolds—Retreat of Black Hawk—Treaty of 1804 Re-affirmed—Bad Faith of the Indians—Invasion of 1832—Volunteers Called For—

Abraham Lincoln one of a Company from Menard county—He is chosen Captain—Rendezvous at Beardstown—Hard Marches across the Country to Oquawka, Prophetstown, and Dixon—Expected Battle Avoided by the Enemy—Discontent among Volunteers—They are Disbanded—Captain Lincoln Remains, Volunteering for Another Term of Service—Skirmishing Fights—Arrival of New Levies—Encounter at Kellogg's Grove—Black Hawk at the Four Lakes—He Retreats—Battle on the Wisconsin—Hastens Forward to the Mississippi—Battle of the Bad-Ax—End of Lincoln's First Campaign—Autobiographic Note..... 27

CHAPTER V.

A New Period in Mr. Lincoln's Life—His Political Opinions—Clay and Jackson—His First Run as a Candidate for Representative—His Election in 1834—Illinois Strongly Democratic—Mr. Lincoln as a Surveyor—Land Speculation Mania—Mr. Lincoln's First Appearance in the Legislature—Banks and Internal Improvements—Whig Measures Democratically Botched—First Meeting of Lincoln with Douglas—The Latter Seeks an Office of the Legislature, and Gets it—Mr. Lincoln Re-elected in 1836—Mr. Douglas also a Member of the House—Distinguished Associates—Internal Improvements Again—Mr. Lincoln's Views on Slavery—The Capital Removed to Springfield—The New Metropolis—The Revolution of 1837—Mr. Lincoln Chosen for a Third Term—John Calhoun, of Lecompton Memory—Lincoln the Whig Leader, and Candidate for Speaker—Close Vote—First Session at Springfield—Lincoln Re-elected in 1840—Partizan Remodeling of the Supreme Court—Lincoln Declines Further Service in the Legislature—His Position as a Statesman at the Close of this Period—A Tribune of the People..... 47

CHAPTER VI.

Mr. Lincoln's Law Studies—His Perseverance under Adverse Circumstances—Licensed to Practice in 1836—His Progress in his Profession—His Qualities as an Advocate—A Romantic and Exciting Incident in his Practice—A Reminiscence of his Early Life—He Renders a Material Service to the Family of an Old Friend—Secures an Acquittal in a Murder Case, in Spite of a Strong Popular Prejudice Unjustly Excited Against the Prisoner—An Affecting Scene—Mr. Lincoln Removes to Springfield in 1837—Devotes Himself to his Profession, Giving up Political Life—His Marriage—The Family of Mrs. Lincoln—Fortunate Domestic Relations—His Children and their Education—Denominational Tendencies—Four Years' Retirement. 62

CHAPTER VII.

Mr. Lincoln's Devotion to Henry Clay—The Presidential Nominations of 1844—The Campaign in Illinois—Mr. Lincoln Makes an Active Canvass for Clay—John Calhoun the Leading Polk Elector—The Tariff Issue Thoroughly Discussed—Method of Conducting the Canvass—The Whigs of Illinois in a Hopeless Minority—Mr. Lincoln's Reputation as a Whig Champion—Renders Efficient Service in Indiana—Mr. Clay's Defeat, and the Consequences—

Mr. Lincoln a Candidate for Congressman in 1846—President Polk's Administration—Condition of the Country—Texas Annexation, the Mexican War, and the Tariff—Political Character of the Springfield District—Mr. Lincoln Elected by an Unprecedented Majority—His Personal Popularity Demonstrated.....	68
---	----

CHAPTER VIII.

The Thirtieth Congress—Its Political Character—The Democracy in a Minority in the House—Robert C. Winthrop Elected Speaker—Distinguished Members in both Houses—Mr. Lincoln takes his Seat as a Member of the House, and Mr. Douglas for the first time as a Member of the Senate, at the same Session—Mr. Lincoln's Congressional Record that of a Clay and Webster Whig—The Mexican War—Mr. Lincoln's Views on the Subject—Misrepresentations—Not an Available Issue for Mr. Lincoln's Opponents—His Resolutions of Inquiry in Regard to the Origin of the War—Mr. Richardson's Resolutions Indorsing the Administration—Mr. Hudson's Resolutions for an Immediate Discontinuance of the War—Voted Against by Mr. Lincoln—Resolutions of Thanks to Gen. Taylor—Mr. Henley's Amendment, and Mr. Ashmun's addition thereto—Resolutions Adopted without Amendment—Mr. Lincoln's First Speech in Congress, on the Mexican War—Mr. Lincoln on Internal Improvements—A Characteristic Campaign Speech—Mr. Lincoln on the Nomination of Gen. Taylor; the Veto Power; National Issues: President and People; the Wilmot Proviso; Platforms; Democratic Sympathy for Clay; Military Heroes and Exploits; Cass a Progressive; Extra Pay; the Whigs and the Mexican War; Democratic Divisions—Close of the Session—Mr. Lincoln on the Stump—Gen. Taylor's Election—Second Session of the Thirtieth Congress—Slavery in the District of Columbia—The Public Lands—Mr. Lincoln as a Congressman—He Retires to Private Life.....	72
--	----

CHAPTER IX.

Mr. Lincoln in Retirement for Five Years—Gen. Taylor's Administration—The Slavery Agitation of 1850—The Compromise of Clay and Fillmore—The "Final Settlement" of 1852—How, and by Whom it was Disturbed—Violation of the Most Positive Pledges—The Kansas Nebraska Bill—Douglas, the Agitator—Popular Indignation and Excitement—Mr. Lincoln Takes Part in the Canvass of 1854—Great Political Changes—The Anti-Nebraska Organization—Springfield Resolutions of 1854—Results of the Election—A Majority of Congressmen and of the Legislature Anti-Nebraska—Election of United States Senator to Succeed Gen. Shields—Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Trumbull—A Magnanimous Sacrifice—Mr. Trumbull Elected.....	119
--	-----

CHAPTER X.

The Republican Party Organized—Their Platform adopted at Bloomington—The Canvass of 1856—Mr. Lincoln Sustains Fremont and Dayton—His Active Labors on the Stump—Col. Bissell Elected Governor of Illinois—Mr. Buchanan Inaugurated—His Kansas Policy—Mr. Douglas Committed to it in June, 1857—John Calhoun His Special Friend—The Springfield Speech of Douglas—Mr. Lincoln's Reply.....	127
---	-----

CHAPTER XI.

The Lecompton Struggle—The Policy of Douglas Changed—He Breaks with the Administration and Loses Caste at the South—Republican Sympathies—Douglas Falters, but Opposes the English Bill—Passage of that Measure—Democratic State Convention of Illinois—Douglas Indorsed, and Efforts for His Re-election Commenced—The Democratic Bolt—Meeting of the Republican State Convention in June—Mr. Lincoln named as the First and Only Choice of the Republicans for Senator—His Great Speech Before the Convention at Springfield—Douglas and Lincoln at Chicago—Speeches at Bloomington and Springfield—Unfairness of the Apportionment Pointed Out by Mr. Lincoln—He Analyzes the Douglas Programme—Seven Joint Debates—Douglas Produces a Bogus Platform, and Propounds Interrogatories—"Unfriendly Legislation"—Lincoln Fully Defines His Position on the Slavery Question—Result of the Campaign—The People for Lincoln; the Apportionment for Douglas—Public opinion.....	141
--	-----

CHAPTER XII.

Mr. Lincoln in Ohio—His Speech at Columbus—Denial of the Negro Suffrage Charge—Troubles of Douglas with His "Great Principle"—Territories Not States—Doctrines of the Fathers—His Cincinnati Speech—"Shooting Over the Line"—What the Republicans Mean to Do—Plain Questions to the Democracy—The People Above Courts and Congress—Uniting the Opposition—Eastern Tour—The Cooper Institute Speech—Mr. Bryant's Introduction—What the Fathers Held—What Will Satisfy the Southern Democracy?—Counsels to the Republicans—Mr. Lincoln Among the Children.....	182
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

The Republican National Convention at Chicago—The Charleston Explosion—"Constitutional Union" Nominations—Distinguished Candidates among the Republicans—The Platform—The Ballotings—Mr. Lincoln Nominated—Unparalleled Enthusiasm—The Ticket Completed with the Name of Senator Hamlin—Its Reception by the Country—Mr. Lincoln's Letter of Acceptance.....	190
Sketch of the Life of Hannibal Hamlin.....	194

CHAPTER I.

MR. LINCOLN'S EARLY BOYHOOD IN KENTUCKY.

Preliminary Remarks.—Ancestry of Abraham Lincoln.—Their Residence in Pennsylvania and Virginia.—His Grandfather Crosses the Alleghanies to join Boone and his Associates.—“The Dark and Bloody Ground.”—His Violent Death.—His Widow Settles in Washington county.—Thomas Lincoln, his Son, Marries and Locates near Hodgenville.—Birth of Abraham Lincoln.—La Rue County.—His Early Life and Training in Kentucky.

THE name of no living man is more prominent, at this moment, on the lips and in the thoughts of the American people, than that of ABRAHAM LINCOLN. This happens not merely because he is the candidate of a great party for the highest political honors. He has a hold upon the public mind which a partizan nomination alone can not account for. This event, indeed, is the effect rather than the cause. An overwhelming popular enthusiasm in certain States where he is best known (and manifested also by the assembled crowds at Chicago, during the memorable week of the Convention) did much to turn the poising balance in his favor, and to determine his selection as a candidate over all his distinguished competitors. The popular response to that decision has been as hearty and as universal as these first demonstrations were unparalleled. The heart of the people has been touched. The sympathies of the masses have been moved, as seldom if ever before in any Presidential canvass.

What Robert Burns has proverbially been to the people of his native land, and, to a certain extent, of all lands, as a bard, Abraham Lincoln seems to have become to us as a statesman and a patriot, by his intimate relations alike with the humbler and the higher walks of life. By his own native energy and

endowment, he has risen from a place of humble obscurity to a commanding position and power among his fellow-men, and achieved an enduring fame. The experiences of the "toiling millions," whether of gladness or of sorrow, have been his experiences. He has an identity with them, such as common toils and common emotions have produced. Thus and otherwise he has become, in person no less than in principle, a genuine representative man in the great cause of FREE LABOR.

This is not the time to enter very minutely into the details of the private life of Mr. LINCOLN. Still in the prime of his manhood, with long years of public service apparently yet before him, and with so large a proportion of those who have been associated with him now remaining on the stage of action, no multiplied and indiscriminate relations, designed merely to gratify public curiosity, should be expected in this connection. When the grand era on which, individually, he is now entering, shall have closed, let the more intimate and searching history of all that he has done, said and suffered, whether as a public or as a private citizen, be attempted by other and more ambitious hands. It is rather the purpose of the present work to furnish the true and complete outline of a life, which, though not uneventful, or wanting in enticing suggestions to the imagination, often tempting the writer aside into romantic episodes and gossiping researches, is more immediately interesting at this time as throwing light upon the mystery we have noted at the outset, and as bearing directly upon the present state of our national politics, to which Mr. Lincoln now holds so important a relation.

The reader is here given a reliable account of the main events of a remarkable career; and should his curiosity at any stage demand more than is given, he may rest assured that nothing has been designedly omitted or glossed over, that tends to illustrate the character, or to affect the public standing of the statesman who is the subject of this memoir. Characteristic anecdotes and personal incidents currently related of him will only be noted in these pages when clearly authentic. Those of questionable authority, or ascertained to be positively fictitious, will be carefully excluded. No statement is haz-

arded which is not capable of verification. A candid estimate of the man, and an accurate representation of his opinions and past acts as a statesman, have been attempted, and such as shall deserve the implicit confidence of the people, of whatever class or partizan predilection. Facts are set down without eulogistic comment, and the views of Mr. Lincoln, with such explanations as justice may seem to require, will usually be given in his own words.

The ancestors of ABRAHAM LINCOLN were of English descent. We find the earliest definite traces of them in Berks county, Pennsylvania, though this was almost certainly not the first place of their residence in this country. Their location, and their adherence to the Quaker faith, make it probable that the original emigration occurred under the auspices of WM. PENN, or at least in company with those who sympathized and shared in his colonizing movement. It was doubtless a branch of the same family that, leaving England under different religious impulses, but with the same adventurous and independent spirit, settled, at an earlier date, in Old Plymouth Colony. The separation may possibly have taken place this side of the Atlantic, and not beyond. Some of the same traits appear conspicuously in both these family groups. One tradition indeed affirms that the Pennsylvania branch was transplanted from Hingham, Mass., and was derived from a common stock with Colonel Benjamin Lincoln, of Revolutionary fame. There is a noticeable coincidence in the general prevalence, among each American branch, of Scriptural names in christening—the Benjamin, Levi, and Ezra, of Massachusetts, having their counterpart in the Abraham, Thomas, and Josiah, of Virginia and Kentucky. The peculiarity is one to have been equally expected among sober Friends, and among zealous Puritans.

Berks county can not have been very long the home of Mr. Lincoln's immediate progenitors. There can hardly have been more than a slender pioneer settlement there, up to the time that one or more of the number made another remove, not far

from 1750, to what is now Rockingham county, Virginia. Old Berks was first settled about 1734,—then, too, as a German colony—and was not organized as a county until 1752; before which date, according to family traditions, this removal to Virginia took place.

This, it will be observed, was pre-eminently a pioneer stock, evidently much in love with backwoods adventure, and constantly courting the dangers and hardships of forest-life.

Rockingham county, Virginia, though intersected by the beautiful valley of the Shenandoah, or rather by two valleys made by its chief forks, not very far from their junction, and inviting, by its natural resources, the advances of civilization, must nevertheless have been, at the time just mentioned, in the very heart of the wilderness. Now, it is one of the most productive counties of Virginia, having exceeded every other county in the State, according to the census of 1850, in its crops of wheat and hay. A branch of the family, it is understood, still remains there, to enjoy the benefits of so judicious a selection, and of the labors and imperfectly requited endurances of these first settlers. It was more than thirty years later than the arrival there of the Lincolns of Pennsylvania, that Rockingham county first had an organized political existence.

From this locality, about the year 1780, perhaps a little later, Abraham Lincoln, grandfather of the one who now bears that name, started westward across the Alleghanies, attracted by the accounts which had reached him of the wonderfully fertile and lovely country explored by Daniel Boone, on and near the Kentucky river. During all his lifetime, hitherto, he could have known little of any other kind of existence than that to which he had been educated as an adventurous frontiersman. The severe labor of preparing the heavily timbered lands of the Shenandoah for cultivation, the wild delights of hunting the then abundant game of the woods, and the exciting hazards of an uncertain warfare with savage enemies, had been almost the sole occupations of his rough but healthful life. Perhaps the settlements around him had already begun to be too far advanced for the highest enjoyment of his characteristic mode of living; or possibly, with others, he aspired to the

possession of more fertile fields, and to an easier subsistence, with new forest-expanses more eligible for the delights of the chase. Whatever the reason, he set out at the time just stated, with his wife and several young children, on his long journey across the mountains, and over the broad valleys intervening between the Shenandoah and the Kentucky.

At this date, and for ten or twelve years later, the present State of Kentucky formed part of the old Commonwealth of Virginia. "The dark and bloody ground," as afterward named for better reasons than the fiction which assigns this meaning to its Indian appellation, had then been but recently entered upon by the white man. Its first explorer, Daniel Boone, whose very name suggests a whole world of romance and adventure, had removed, when a mere boy, among the earlier emigrants from Eastern Pennsylvania, to Berks county. Here he must have been a contemporary resident, and was perhaps an acquaintance, of some of the younger members of the Lincoln family. At all events, as substantially one of their own neighbors, they must have watched his later course with eager interest and sympathy, and caught inspiration from his exploits. At eighteen, Boone had again emigrated, with his father as before, to the banks of the Yadkin, a mountain river in the north-west of North Carolina, at just about the same date as the removal of the Lincolns to Virginia. Some years later, Boone, in his hunting excursions, had passed over and admired large tracts of the wilderness north of his home, and especially along a branch of the Cumberland river, within the limits of what is now Kentucky. It was not until 1769, however, that, with five associates, he made the thorough exploration of the Kentucky valley, which resulted in the subsequent settlements there. The glowing descriptions which ultimately got abroad of the incredible richness and beauty of these new and remote forest-climes of Trans-Alleghanian Virginia, and of their alluring hunting-grounds, must have early reached the ears of the boyhood-companions of Daniel Boone, and spread through the neighboring country. The stirring adventures of the pioneer hero, during the next five or six years, and the beginnings of substantial settlements in that far-west country,

must have suggested new attractions thitherward to the more active and daring spirits, whose ideal of manhood Boone so nearly approached.

From the borders, in various directions, hundreds of miles away, emigration had now begun. These recruits were from that class of hardy frontiersmen most inured to the kind of toils they were to encounter anew in the Kentucky forests. They went forward, fearless of the dangers to be encountered from the numerous bands of Indians already recommencing hostilities, after a temporary pacification. Here was a common territory and place of meeting for the tribes, both of the North and the South, and here, before and after this date, there were many exciting adventures and deadly conflicts with these savages, whose favorite haunts had been thus uncereemoniously invaded.

It was not far from the date of the disastrous battle of the Lower Blue Licks, that the grandfather of Mr. Lincoln, with his young family, reached the region which had perhaps long been the promised land of his dreams. This transmigration was certainly some time later than 1778, and earlier than 1784, as circumstances hereafter to be stated will show. Boone, Kenton, Harrod, Floyd, and their brave associates, were still in the midst of the great struggles which have given them lasting memory in history. Lincoln was ambitious to share their fortunes, and to fix his home in this more genial and opulent clime.

The exact place at which he settled is not known. It was somewhere on Floyd's creek, and probably near its mouth, in what is now Bullitt county. The hopes which led to this change of his home were not destined to be fulfilled. He had made but a mere beginning in his new pioneer labors, when, while at work one day, at a distance from his cabin, unsuspecting of danger, he was killed by an Indian, who had stolen upon him unaware. This took place in the year 1784, or very near that time, when he was probably not more than thirty-five years of age. His widow, thus suddenly bereaved in a new and strange land, had now their three sons and two daughters left to her sole protection and care, with probably little means

for their support. She soon after removed to what became Washington county, in the same State, not far distant, and there reared her children, all of whom reached mature age. One of the daughters was married to a Mr. Crume, and the other to a man named Bromfield. The three sons, respectively named Thomas, Mordecai, and Josiah, all remained in Kentucky until after their majority.

Thomas Lincoln, one of these sons, was born in 1778. He was a mere child when his father removed to Kentucky, and was but six years old at the time of the latter's death. The date of this event was consequently about 1784. Of the early life of the orphan boy, we have no knowledge, except what can be learned of the general lot of his class, and of the habits and modes of living then prevalent among the hardy pioneers of Kentucky. These backwoodsmen had an unceasing round of hard toils, with no immediate reward but a bare subsistence from year to year, and the cheering promise of better days in the future. But even their lands, as in the case of Boone, they were not always so fortunate as to retain in fee.

More comfortable days, and a much improved state of things had come, before Thomas arrived at maturity, but in his boyhood and youth, he must have known whatever was worst in the trials and penury of the first generation of Kentucky frontiersmen, with few other enjoyments than an occasional practice with his rifle. His training was suited to develop a strong, muscular frame, and a rugged constitution, with a characteristic quickness of perception and promptness of action. The Kentuckian of that and the succeeding generation had generally a tall, stalwart frame, a frank and courteous heart, and a humorous and slightly quaint turn of speech; a fondness for adventure and for the sports of hunting; a manly self-respect, and a fearless independence of spirit.

"Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,

* * * * *

Intent on high designs, a thoughtful band,

By forms unfashioned, fresh from nature's hand,

Fierce in their native hardiness of soul

True to imagined right, above control.

This generation began its life with the independent existence of the nation, and partook largely of the spirit of exultant self-confidence then abroad through the land.

These were the circumstances and associations under which, in those primeval days in Kentucky, Thomas Lincoln passed through the period of boyhood and youth. At the date of the political separation from Virginia, in 1792, and the formation of a new State, this orphan boy, struggling to aid his mother in the support of the ill-fortuned family, had reached the age of fourteen. The currents of emigration had become enlarged and accelerated, meantime, until the population was swelled, as early as 1790, to more than 73,000; and during the next ten years it was more than trebled, reaching 220,000. The wilderness that once was around Boonesborough, Harrodsburg, and Lexington, was now blossoming as the rose. Still, however, there was ample space unoccupied, within the limits of the new State, for those who craved the excitements and the loneliness of a home in the wilderness.

In 1806, Thomas Lincoln, being then twenty-eight years of age, was married to Nancy Hanks, a native of Virginia, and settled in what was then Hardin county, Kentucky. It does not appear that the parents of Miss Hanks ever removed to Kentucky, though others of the family did so. Of the history of her ancestry, we have no definite particulars. Her position in life appears to have been not dissimilar to that of her husband. That she possessed some rare qualities of mind and heart, there is reason to believe; although, dying at an early age, and having, from the time of her marriage, passed her days on obscure frontiers, few recollections of her are accessible.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN was born of these parents on the 12th day of February, 1809. The place where they at this time resided, is in what is now LaRue county, about a mile and a half from Hodgenville, the county seat, and seven miles from Elizabethtown, laid off several years previously, and the county seat of Hardin county. He had one sister, two years his senior, who grew up to womanhood, married, and died while young. He had a brother, two years younger than himself,

who died in early childhood. Mr. Lincoln remembers to have visited the now unmarked grave of this little one, along with his mother, before leaving Kentucky. These were the only children of Thomas Lincoln, either by the present or by a subsequent marriage, hereafter to be noticed. ABRAHAM has thus, for a long time, been the sole immediate representative of this hardy and energetic race.

LaRue county, named from an early settler, John LaRue, was set off and separately organized in 1843, the portion containing Mr. Lincoln's birthplace having been, up to that date, included in Hardin county. It is a rich grazing country in its more rolling or hilly parts, and the level surface produces good crops of corn and tobacco. In the northern borders of the county, on the Rolling Fork of Salt river, is Muldrow's Hill, a noted eminence. Hodgenville, near which Mr. Lincoln was born, is a pleasantly situated town on Nolin creek, and a place of considerable business. About a mile above this town, on the creek, is a mound, or knoll, thirty feet above the banks of the stream, containing two acres of level ground, at the top of which there is now a house. Some of the early pioneers encamped on this knoll; and but a short distance from it a fort was erected by Philip Phillips, an emigrant from Pennsylvania, about 1780 or 1781, near the time Mr. Lincoln's ancestor arrived from Virginia. John LaRue came from the latter State, with a company of emigrants, and settled, not far from the same date, at Phillips' Fort. Robert Hodgen, LaRue's brother-in-law, purchased and occupied the land on which Hodgenville is built. Both these pioneers were men of sterling integrity, and high moral worth. They were consistent and zealous members of the Baptist church, and one of their associates, Benjamin Lynn, was a minister of the same persuasion. Such were the influences under which, more than twenty years before Thomas Lincoln settled there, this little colony had been founded, and which went far to give the community its permanent character.

It is needless to rehearse the kind of life in which Abraham Lincoln was here trained. The picture is similar in all such settlements. In his case, there was indeed the advantage

of a generation or two of progress, since his grandfather had hazarded and lost his life in the then slightly broken wilderness. The State now numbered some 400,000 inhabitants, and had all the benefits of an efficient local administration, the want of which had greatly increased the dangers and difficulties of the first settlers. Henry Clay, it may here be appropriately mentioned, had already, though little more than thirty years of age, begun his brilliant political career, having then served for a year or two in the United States Senate.

Yet, with all these changes, the humble laborers, settled near "Hodgen's Mills," on Nolin creek, had no other lot but incessant toil, and a constant struggle with nature in the still imperfectly reclaimed wilds, for a plain subsistence. Here the boy spent the first years of his childhood. With apparently the same frowning fortune which darkened the early days of Robert Burns, it was not destined that young Lincoln's father should succeed in these first endeavors to secure a competency. Even before the date of his earliest distinct recollections, he removed with his father to a place six miles distant from Hodgenville, which was also ere long to be surrendered, as we shall presently see, for a home in the far-off wilderness, and for frontier life, in its fullest and most significant meaning.

The period of ABRAHAM LINCOLN's Kentucky life extends through a little more than seven years, terminating with the autumn of 1816. If it be true as a rule (as Horace Mann was wont to maintain), that the experiences and instructions of the first seven years of every person's existence, do more to mold and determine his general character, than all subsequent training, then must we regard Mr. Lincoln as a Kentuckian (of the generation next following that of Clay), by his early impressions and discipline, no less than by birth.

In those days there were no common schools in that country. The principal reliance for acquiring the rudiments of learning was the same as that to which the peasant-poet of Ayrshire was indebted. Education was by no means disregarded, nor did young Lincoln, poor as were his opportunities, grow up an illiterate boy, as some have supposed. Competent teachers were accustomed to offer themselves then, as in later years,

who opened private schools for a neighborhood, being supported by tuition or subscription. During his boyhood days in Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln attended, at different times, at least two schools of this description, of which he has clear recollections. One of these was kept by Zachariah Riney, a Roman Catholic, whose peculiarities have not been wholly effaced from the memory of his since so distinguished pupil. But although this teacher was himself an ardent Catholic, he made no proselyting efforts in his school, and when any little religious ceremonies, or perhaps mere catechizing and the like, were to be gone through with, all Protestant children, of whom, it is needless to say that young "Abe" was one, were accustomed to retire, by permission or command. Riney was probably in some way connected with the movement of the "Trappists," who came to Kentucky in the autumn of 1805, and founded an establishment (abandoned some years later) under Urban Guillet, as superior, on Pottinger's Creek. They were active in promoting education, especially among the poorer classes, and had a school for boys under their immediate supervision. This, however, had been abandoned before the date of Lincoln's first school-days, and it is not improbable that the private schools under Catholic teachers were an offshoot of the original system adopted by these Trappists, who subsequently removed to Illinois.

Another teacher, on whose instructions the boy afterward attended, while living in Kentucky, was named Caleb Hazel. His was also a neighborhood school, sustained by private patronage.

With the aid of these two schools, and with such further assistance as he received at home, there is no doubt that he had become able to read well, though without having made any great literary progress, at the age of seven. That he was not a dull or inapt scholar, is manifest from his subsequent attainments. With the allurements of the rifle and the wild game which then abounded in the country, however, and with the meager advantages he had, in regard to books, it is certain that his perceptive faculties, and his muscular powers, were

much more fully developed by exercise than his scholastic talents.

While he lived in Kentucky, he never saw even the exterior of what was properly a church edifice. The religious services he attended were held either at a private dwelling, or in some log school-house, or in the open grove :

“ Fit shrine for humble worshiper to hold
Communion with his Maker. These dim vaults,
These winding aisles, of human pomp or pride
Report not. No fantastic carvings show
The boast of our vain race, to change the form
Of Thy fair works. But Thou art here, Thou fill'st
The solitude.” †

Unsatisfactory results of these many years' toil on the lands of Nolin Creek, or a restless spirit of adventure and fondness for more genuine pioneer excitements than this region continued to afford, led Thomas Lincoln, now verging upon the age of forty, and his son beginning to be of essential service in manual labor, to seek a new place of abode, far to the west, beyond the Ohio river.

† Bryant.

CHAPTER II.

MR. LINCOLN'S EARLY LIFE IN INDIANA.

The Removal from Kentucky.—An Emigrant Journey.—The Forests of Southern Indiana.—New Home of the Lincoln Family.—Indiana in 1816.—Slavery and Free Labor.—Young Lincoln at His Work.—His Schools and Schoolmasters.—Self-Education.—A Characteristic Incident.—Acquaintance with River Life.—His First Trip to New Orleans as a Flatboatman.—Death of His Mother.—His Father's Second Marriage.—Recollections of an Early Settler.—Close of an Eventful Period in Young Lincoln's History.

EARLY in the autumn of 1816, an immediate departure for the new wilds of Indiana was determined on by Thomas Lincoln. It was no very imposing sight, certainly, as the little family, bidding the old Kentucky home adieu, moved forward upon their long and winding pioneer march. Many sad thoughts there undoubtedly were in that small group, and perhaps some forebodings also, as their former place, gradually receding, at length disappeared from their reverted eyes. But these emotions must soon have been lost in the excitements of their journey.

It was no novel picture which they presented, for that period, as they advanced on their lonely way, for the days required to bring them to the place whence they were to cross the "Beautiful River." The plain wagon, with its simple covering as a shelter for its lading of household utensils, articles of food, and "varieties," was drawn by a not too spirited or over-fed horse, in a harness probably compounded of leather and hempen cords of an uncertain age. In the forward part of this conveyance, sat the emigrant wife and her daughter, nine years old, while the father and his son, now past seven, walking in the rear, took care that the indispensable cow kept pace to the

music of the jolting wheels. Underneath the wagon, or scouting at pleasure through the surrounding woods, was of course a large dog, constant to the fortunes of his master's family, and ready for any fate to which their migrations might lead him. Arrived at the appointed landing on the banks of the Ohio, it only remained to embark the little caravan upon a flatboat, and to cross the stream, now swelled to fair proportions by the autumn rains. Finally, after reaching the Indiana side, the adventurers landed at or near the mouth of Anderson's Creek, now the boundary between the counties of Perry and Spencer, about one hundred and forty miles below Louisville, by the river, and sixty above Evansville. In a direct line across the country from their former residence, the distance is perhaps hardly one hundred miles.

The place at which Mr. Lincoln settled, at the end of this journey, is some distance back from the Ohio river, near the present town of Gentryville. Under the earliest organization, this was in Perry county, of which Troy was the county seat. Two years later, Spencer county was formed, embracing all that part of Perry west of Anderson's Creek, and including the place at which Mr. Lincoln had located himself.

Here his emigrant wagon paused, and aided by the busy hands of his son, a log cabin was speedily built, which was to be their home through many coming years. The particular site of his dwelling was doubtless determined, as usual, by the discovery of a living spring of water, after fixing on his selection for a farm. This completed, and a shelter provided for their stock, the next business was to clear up a space in the forest which should produce a crop of grain for their sustenance the next season. Hard work had begun in good earnest for the young Kentuckian. He was to learn the realities of genuine pioneer life, such as he had before but imperfectly understood, unless by tradition and the evening tales of his father.

Indiana, at this date, was still a Territory, having been originally united under the same government with Illinois, after the admission of Ohio as a State, "the first-born of the great North-west," in 1802. A separate territorial organization was made for each in 1809. A few months before the arrival

of Thomas Lincoln, namely, in June, 1816, pursuant to a Congressional "enabling act," a Convention had been held which adopted a State Constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union. Under this Constitution, a month or two later, in December, 1816, Indiana became, by act of Congress, a sovereign State.

The population of Indiana was now about 65,000, distributed chiefly south of a straight line drawn from Vincennes, on the Wabash, to Lawrenceburg, on the Ohio. Vincennes was long the territorial capital, and with the surrounding country, had been occupied by French emigrants, many years before the Revolution. In 1800, the whole number of residents in these colonies was less than 5,000. These, like other French settlements, made little progress of themselves. From 1800 to 1810 there had been a large increase, mostly by emigrations to Southern Indiana from Kentucky, swelling the population to 24,520, at the latter date. In 1811 had occurred serious difficulties with the Indians, terminating in the decisive victory over them at Tippecanoe. So general had become the settlements, eastward from Vincennes and up the Ohio river, that the capital was removed far eastward to Corydon, in 1813, as a central location. This place, the capital of Harrison county, is about twenty-five miles west from Louisville, and more than a hundred south of the present metropolis of the State. But one county intervened between Harrison and Perry, and Gentryville is hardly forty miles, in a direct line, from Corydon. This place continued to be the seat of government for the State until 1824, as it had been for the Territory during the three years next preceding 1816. It was but natural, therefore, that emigration should be prominently directed to this part of the State, at the period under consideration. In 1820 the population had increased to over 147,000, or more than six-fold during ten years, and nearly thirty-fold since 1800.

There is little doubt that in emigrating, Thomas Lincoln had fallen in with a prevalent contagion in his own State, and that he took up his residence in the part of Indiana then deemed most desirable of all that was unoccupied. It is common to attribute these extensive migrations from the border slave-

holding States into the non-slaveholding Northwest, to a preference for institutions based upon free labor to the exclusion of slavery. This was, beyond question, a powerful inducement with many, yet by no means the exclusive one; and with some it did not exist at all. In the earlier days of Kentucky, the proportion of slaves to the free white population was small, and in many places slavery can hardly have been an appreciable element. But in 1816, the number of slaves must have exceeded 100,000, and their ratio of increase was becoming very high. Upon a man in the circumstances of Mr. Lincoln, with a young family to rear, this consideration undoubtedly had its weight, among the others we have suggested as the cause of his removal to Indiana. We have at least the fact, that, though painfully, and with an exile's sadness, he turned his back forever on a State that tolerated slavery, to seek a new home where free labor had been sacredly assured exclusive rights and honors.

The next thirteen years Abraham Lincoln spent here, in Southern Indiana, near the Ohio, nearly midway between Louisville and Evansville. He was now old enough to begin to take an active part in the farm labors of his father, and he manfully performed his share of hard work. He learned to use the axe and to hold the plough. He became inured to all the duties of seed-time and harvest. On many a day, during every one of those thirteen years, this Kentucky boy might have been seen with a long "gad" in his hand, driving his father's team in the field, or from the woods with a heavy draught, or on the rough path to the mill, the store, or the river landing—very probably at times, in the language of the Hoosier bard, descriptive of such pioneer workers in general:

" — *sans* shoes or socks on,
With snake-pole and a yoke of oxen."

A vigorous constitution, and a cheerful, unrepining disposition, made all his labors comparatively light. To such a one, this sort of life has in it much of pleasant excitement to compensate for its hardships. He learned to derive enjoyment from the severest lot. The "dignity of labor," which is with

demagogues such hollow cant, became to him a true and appreciable reality.

Here, as in Kentucky, he attended private schools, and in other ways increased his little stock of learning, aided by what he had already acquired. The same want of systematic public instruction, and the same mode of remedying this lack, prevailed in Indiana, as in his former home. One of his teachers was named Andrew Crawford, to whom he used to be occasionally indebted for the loan of books, to read at such leisure hours as he could command. His last teacher was a Mr. Dorsey, who has had the satisfaction, in later years, of taking his former scholar by the hand, rejoicing to recognize the once obscure boy as now one of the foremost leaders of the people. Dorsey was lately residing in Schuyler county, Illinois, where he also had sons living.

That we may estimate Mr. Lincoln in his true character, as chiefly a self-educated man, it should be stated that, summing up all the days of his actual attendance upon school instruction, the amount would hardly exceed one year. The rest he has accomplished for himself in his own way. As a youth he read with avidity such instructive works as he could obtain, and in winter evenings, by the mere light of the blazing fireplace, when no better resource was at hand.

An incident having its appropriate connection here, and illustrating several traits of the man, as already developed in early boyhood, is vouched for by a citizen of Evansville, who knew him in the days referred to. In his eagerness to acquire knowledge, young Lincoln had borrowed of Mr. Crawford a copy of Weems' *Life of Washington*—the only one known to be in existence in the neighborhood. Before he had finished reading the book, it had been left, by a not unnatural oversight, in a window. Meantime, a rain storm came on, and the book was so thoroughly wet as to make it nearly worthless. This mishap caused him much pain; but he went, in all honesty, to Crawford with the ruined book, explained the calamity that had happened through his neglect, and offered, not having sufficient money, to "work out" the value of the book.

"Well, Abe," said Crawford, "as it's you I won't be hard on

you. Come over and pull fodder for me for two days, and we will call our accounts even."

The offer was accepted and the engagement literally fulfilled. As a boy, no less than since, Abraham Lincoln had an honorable conscientiousness, integrity, industry, and an ardent love of knowledge.

The town on the Ohio river nearest his home was Troy, the capital of Perry county down to the date of its division. This place, at the mouth of Anderson's Creek, had been settled as early as 1811, and was a place of some consequence, both for its river trade and as the county seat. After this latter advantage was lost, by the formation of a new county in 1818, Troy dwindled away, and is now a place of only about five hundred inhabitants. Rockport, nearly twenty miles south-west of Gentryville, became the capital of Spencer county, and thenceforward a point of interest to the new settlers. It is situated on a high bluff of the Ohio river, and receives its name from "Lady Washington's Rock," a picturesque hanging-rock at that place. At these two points, young Lincoln gained some knowledge of the new world of river life and business, in addition to his farm experience, and to his forest sports with rod and rifle.

It was during one of the later of these thirteen years, that Abraham, at nineteen, was permitted to gratify his eager longing to see more of the world, and to try the charms of an excursion on the Beautiful River. He had inherited much of the adventurous and stirring disposition of his Virginian grandfather, and was delighted with the prospect of a visit to New Orleans, then the splendid city of Western dreams. He performed this journey, on a common flat-boat, doing service as one of the hands on that long yet most exhilarating trip. We have no particulars of this his sole excursion as a FLATBOATMAN during his Indiana days, yet to his own mind it probably still affords many not unpleasing recollections. He was undoubtedly the life of the little company, delighting them with his humorous sallies no less than with his muscular superiority and with his hilarious activity and intuitive tact in all that immediately concerned their voyage.

If there had been any forebodings at the time of departure from their first home on Nolin Creek, these were to be ere long realized by the Indiana emigrants. Scarcely two years had passed, in this changed climate, and in these rougher forest experiences, before the mother of young Abraham—perhaps too gentle to encounter the new trials added to those she had before partially surmounted, and to endure the malarious influences in which this wild country abounded—was called to a last separation from those she had so tenderly loved. She died in 1818, leaving as her sole surviving children, a daughter less than twelve years old, and a son two years younger, of whose future distinction, even with a mother's fondness, she probably had but an indefinite hope. A grave was made for her—

“Where the wind of the West breathes its softest sigh;
Where the silvery stream is flowing nigh—
Where the sun's warm smile may never dispel
Night's tears o'er the form that was loved so well—
Where no column proud in the sun may glow,
To mock the heart that is resting below.”

A year or two later, Thomas Lincoln contracted a second marriage with Mrs. Johnston, a widow with three children, that were brought up with those of Mr. Lincoln. Besides these step-children, there were no additions to the family as before enumerated.

In concluding this brief account of the thirteen important years which were spent by Abraham Lincoln as an Indianian, the personal recollections of a distinguished lawyer and statesman of an older generation, who emigrated to Indiana at nearly the same date, will aid in conveying a correct impression of those times, and of the circumstances with which the youth was surrounded.

Indiana, says the late Hon. O. H. Smith,* “was born in the year 1816, with some sixty-five thousand inhabitants—only about forty years ago. A few counties only were then organ-

* Early Indiana Trials and Sketches Reminiscences, by Hon. O. H. Smith, page 285.

ized. The whole middle, north, and north-west portions of the State were an unbroken wilderness, in the possession of the Indians. Well do I remember when there were but two families settled west of the Whitewater Valley—one at Flat Rock, above where Rushville now stands, and the other on Brandywine, near where Greenfield was afterward located. When I first visited the ground on which Indianapolis now stands, the whole country, east to Whitewater and west to the Wabash, was a dense, unbroken forest. There were no public roads, no bridges over any of the streams. The traveler had literally to swim his way. No cultivated farms, no houses to shelter or feed the weary traveler, or his jaded horse. The courts, years afterward, were held in log huts, and the juries sat under the shade of the forest trees. I was Circuit Prosecuting Attorney at the time of the trials at the falls of Fall Creek, where Pendleton now stands. Four of the prisoners were convicted of murder, and three of them hung, for killing Indians. The court was held in a double log cabin, the grand jury sat upon a log in the woods, and the foreman signed the bills of indictment which I had prepared, upon his knee; there was not a petit juror that had shoes on—all wore moccasins, and were belted around the waist, and carried side knives used by the hunter. The products of the country consisted of peltries, the wild game killed in the forest by the Indian hunters, the fish caught in the interior lakes, rivers, and creeks, the pawpaw, wild plum, haws, small berries gathered by the squaws in the woods. The travel was confined to the single horse and his rider, the commerce to the pack-saddle, and the navigation to the Indian canoe. Many a time and oft have I crossed our swollen streams, by day and by night, sometimes swimming my horse, and at others paddling the rude bark canoe of the Indian. Such is a mere sketch of our State when I traversed its wilds, and I am not one of its first settlers."

Thus it was that young Lincoln grew up to the verge of manhood; he led no idle or enervating existence. Brought up to the habits of sobriety, and accustomed to steady labor, no one of all the working-men with whom he came in contact

was a better sample of his class than he. He had now become a Saul among his associates, having reached the height of nearly six feet and four inches, and with a comparatively slender yet uncommonly strong, muscular frame. He was even then, in his mental and moral characteristics, no less than in his physical proportions, one not to be forgotten or unappreciated by those who knew him. Many reminiscences of those days of his hardy endeavor and rough experience linger in the minds of the plain, earnest people among whom his lot for a long period was thus cast, and will some time be repeated, with such exaggerations or fabulous glosses as are wont gradually to gather, like the sacred halo of the painters, around the memorials of a recognized hero. And a hero, ever hereafter, in the traditions of Southern Indiana, will be the youthful Abraham Lincoln, gigantic and stalwart in his outward form, no less than in the glowing and noble spirit already beginning to foresee and prepare for a high destiny. Wherever he has dwelt becomes classic and consecrated ground, and to have known him, even in his obscurest days, will be deemed a circumstance to be recounted with pride. To gather up such recollections and to perpetuate them with the pen, will be the work of future times and other hands.

This period of young Lincoln's life was terminated by another removal of his father, as will appear in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

FIRST YEARS IN ILLINOIS.—1830-32.

The French Settlements.—The North-West.—The Advance of Emigration.—Four Great States Founded in the Lifetime of Mr. Lincoln's Father.—North and South Meeting in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.—Sentiments of Southern Emigrants.—The First Emigrations.—A Coincidence of Dates.—Mordecai and Josiah Lincoln.—Removal to Illinois.—Settlement on the Sangamon, in Macon County.—The Locality described.—Abraham Lincoln Splits Three Thousand Rails.—Another Removal of his Father.—They Separate.—His Father Spends the rest of his Days in Coles County.—Abraham Lincoln makes Another Trip as a Flatboatman.—Becomes Clerk in a Store on his Return.—Leaves the Business after a Year's Service.

THE early French settlements of Illinois, at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, had proved as little successful or permanent as those of Indiana around Vincennes. The territory had come into the possession of the British Government just before the Revolution, and emigration from Virginia had commenced almost simultaneously to that quarter and to Kentucky. In 1787, as is well known, the settlements here, in common with those scattered throughout the great expanse of United States territory, Northwest of the Ohio river, were brought under a territorial government, as wide in its local scope as it was apparently insignificant in the extent of its population and power. Time speedily demonstrated the error of such an estimate of the remarkable region between the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Lakes, yet, even to this day, the people of the East accept the idea of this greatness and coming power rather as an abstract proposition than as a living reality, deeply affecting their own relative interests and the common resources and grandeur of the country.

The rapid growth of Kentucky on the one side, and of Ohio and Indiana on the other, we have incidentally seen in these pages. The birth of Mr. Lincoln's father, Thomas Lincoln, was anterior to or nearly coeval with the very first settlements in all those States, excepting only the lifeless French colonies of Indiana. The State of Illinois may be added to those of which it may be said, in like manner, his own life was the measure of their age, dating from the first substantial and growing existence of their colonial settlements. In Illinois, as in Indiana, the earliest waves of a healthful emigration had come from Kentucky and Virginia, and in both cases alike, the Southern portion was the earliest to be occupied. Between these early outflowings of free labor from the land of slavery, and those later ones from the free States of the East, on more northern parallels, there is a marked difference, still traceable—creating, in a certain sense, in all the States of the Northwest which touch the imaginary line of Mason and Dixon, a division of North and South. Experience and increased commingling between these localities are fast abating the distinctness of this somewhat indefinite separating line, but for years to come it can not be wholly obliterated. These two elements, combined and consolidated, growing into unity instead of being arrayed against each other in widening separation, will go to constitute the strongest of States. The Southern emigration gave character to the earlier legislation of Indiana and Illinois especially. With evidences of a lurking attachment to the peculiar institution of the States on the other side of the Ohio river, the general tenor of public sentiment and action was as positive and distinct, as were the opinions of the more Northern multitudes who came in to fill up these new commonwealths. And yet the views of slavery prevalent in southern Indiana and Illinois, were at that time not much diverse from those which were entertained in the communities from which these settlers had come. They regarded slavery as an evil to be rid of; and to make sure of this, those who were not already too much entangled with it, left in large numbers for a region which, by request of Virginia herself, the donor, was “forever” protected from the inroads of this moral and social mischief.

As we have seen, Indiana had more than 100,000 people concentrated in the south, before any real advance had been made in the central and northern parts. Nearly the same thing was true of Illinois. The territory had been separately organized in the same year with the birth of Abraham Lincoln—1809. The next year's census showed its entire white population to be only 11,501. These were almost exclusively located south of the National Road, which crosses the Kaskaskia river at Vandalia, extending nearly due west to Alton. Notwithstanding the severe labors of opening the forests on the rich western soil, and the long period that must necessarily elapse between the first clearing therein and the perfect subjugation of the selected lands into cultivated farms, there seems to have been a general avoidance, even down to comparatively a late period, of the open prairie, which is now thought to offer such pre-eminent facilities for cultivation, with almost immediate repayment for the toil bestowed. The settlers who had gone into Illinois, evidently placed a low estimate upon the prairie lands, and always settled on the banks of some stream, on which there was plenty of timber, seeking the forest by preference for their homes. The open character of the country undoubtedly repelled emigration, and caused it to be concentrated on the chief streams, for a long time, when at last it commenced in earnest.

In 1820, two years after admission into the Union, the entire population, still almost entirely confined to the same region, and to similar localities as ten years before, amounted to only 55,211. From that time to 1830, there was some extension of the settlements northward, toward the center of the State, and up the Mississippi to Galena, where the mines were already worked. The rivers along which the principal settlements had been made, aside from the great boundary rivers, the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Wabash, were the Kaskaskia, the Embarras, the Sangamon, and their branches. There were a few settlements, also, in the Rock-river country, and on the range of Peoria. The population, thus chiefly distributed, had now (1830) reached 157,445.

The brothers of Thomas Lincoln, had previously removed

to a more northern location in Indiana, than that which he had occupied. Both settled in the Blue-river country—Mordecai in Hancock county, where he not long after died, and Josiah in Harrison county. Their example, perhaps, had its influence upon Thomas, who, however, took a course of his own. Whatever the immediate or remote occasion, he left Indiana in the spring of 1830, to seek another place of abode, in the State of Illinois. He had seen the growth of Kentucky from almost the very start, to a population of nearly 700,000, and he had lived in Indiana from the time its inhabitants numbered only 65,000, until they had reached nearly 350,000. As he first set his foot within the limits of Illinois, its vast territory had, comparatively, but just begun to be occupied, scarcely at all, as we have seen, except in the extreme southern portion, and here almost exclusively along the principal streams. In a country so poorly supplied with wood and water, as Illinois, such sites would naturally be the first to be taken up, and with a prairie addition, suited the tastes even of those to whom the level, open country was forbidding in appearance.

Mr. Lincoln pushed forward to the central part of the State, where such locations were still abundant. A more beautiful country than that of the Sangamon valley, could not easily have been anywhere discovered by an explorer. It was not strange that the report of such lands, if he heard it in his Southern Indiana home, should have attracted even so far one who was bred to pioneer life, and inherited a migratory disposition. He first settled on the Sangamon "bottom," in Macon county.

Passing over the Illinois Central Railroad, as you approach Decatur, the county-seat of Macon, from the south, a slightly broken country is reached two or three miles from that place, and presently the North Fork of the Sangamon, over which you pass, a mile from the town. This stream flows westwardly, uniting with the South Fork, near Jamestown, ten miles from Springfield. Following down this North Fork for a distance of about ten miles from Decatur, you come to the immediate vicinity of the first residence of Abraham Lincoln (with his father's family), in Illinois.

Here, for the first season of his abode in the new State, he continued to assist his father in his farm-work. One of the first duties was to fence in a field on the rich bottom-lands, which had been selected for cultivation. For this purpose, with the help of one laborer, Abraham Lincoln, at this time, split THREE THOUSAND RAILS—the crowning work of a long laborious period of his life. The hand who aided him in this exploit, named John Hanks, a distant relative of his mother, is yet living, and bears earnest testimony to the strength and skill with which the maul and the wedge were employed on this occasion.

For some unexplained reason, the family did not remain on this place but a single year. Abraham was now of age, and when, in the spring of 1831, his father set out for Coles county, sixty or seventy miles to the eastward, on the upper waters of the Kaskaskia and Embarras, a separation took place, the son for the first time assuming his independence, and commencing life on his own account. The scene of these labors he has not since visited. His father was soon after comfortably settled in the place to which he had turned his course, and spent the remainder of his adventurous days there, arriving at a good old age. He died in Coles county, on the 17th day of January, 1851, being in his seventy-third year. The farm on the Sangamon subsequently came into the possession of a man named Whitley, who also erected a mill in the vicinity.

While there was snow on the ground, at the close of the year 1830, or early in 1831, a man came to that part of Macon county where young Lincoln was living, in pursuit of hands to aid him in a flatboat voyage down the Mississippi. The fact was known that the youth had once made such a trip, and his services were sought for the occasion. As one who had his own subsistence to earn, with no capital but his hands, and with no immediate opportunities for commencing professional study, if his thoughts had as yet been turned in that direction, he accepted the proposition made him. Perhaps there was something of his inherited and acquired fondness for exciting adventure, impelling him to this decision. With him, were

also employed, his former fellow-laborer, John Hanks, and a son of his step-mother, named John Johnston. In the spring of 1831, Lincoln set out to fulfill his engagement. The floods had so swollen the streams that the Sangamon country was a vast sea before him. His first entrance into that county was over these wide-spread waters, in a canoe. The time had come to join his employer on his journey to New-Orleans, but the latter had been disappointed by another person on whom he relied to furnish him a boat, on the Illinois river. Accordingly, all hands set to work and themselves built a boat, on that river, for their purposes. This done, they set out on their long trip, making a successful voyage to New Orleans and back. It is reported by his friends, that Mr. Lincoln refers with much pleasant humor to this early experience, so relating some of its incidents as to afford abundant amusement to his auditors. In truth, he was a youth who could adapt himself to this or any other honest work, which his circumstances required of him, and with a cheerfulness and alacrity—a certain practical humor—rarely equaled. He could turn off the hardest labor as a mere pastime; and his manly presence, to other laborers, was as a constant inspiration and a charm to lighten their burdens.

It was midsummer when the FLATBOATMAN returned from this his second and last trip, in that capacity. The man who had commanded this little expedition now undertook to establish himself in business at New Salem, twenty miles below Springfield, in Menard county—a place of more relative consequence then than now—two miles from Petersburg, the county seat. He had found young Lincoln a person of such sort that he was anxious to secure his services in the new enterprise he was about to embark in. He opened a store at New Salem, and also had a mill for flouring grain. For want of other immediate employment, and in the same spirit which had heretofore actuated him, Abraham Lincoln now entered upon the duties of a clerk, having an eye to both branches of the business carried on by his employer. This connection continued for nearly a year, all the duties of his position being faithfully and cheerfully performed.

It was to this year's humble but honorable service—one that would have been ennobled by his alacrity in discharging it, as a necessity of his lot, were the employment far less dignified than it really was—that Mr. Douglas tauntingly alluded, in one of his speeches during the canvass of 1858, as “keeping a grocery.” In his reply, Mr. Lincoln declared his adversary to be “wofully at fault” as to the fact, in alleging him to have been a grocery-keeper, though it might be no great sin had the statement been well founded. He added that, in truth, he had “never kept a grocery anywhere in the world.”

The business of this country merchant at New Salem did not prove remarkably successful. In any event, the employment was not such as could have permanently suited an active, muscular person, like young Lincoln, with a lurking passion for adventure, and for more exciting scenes. His clerkship days, however, were brought to an abrupt close, probably much sooner than they otherwise would have been, by the breaking out of the Black-Hawk war, in which he was eager to bear an honorable part.

CHAPTER IV.

SERVICE IN THE BLACK-HAWK WAR—1832.

Breaking Out of the Black-Hawk War.—The Invasion of 1831.—The Rock-river Country Threatened.—Prompt Action of Gov. Reynolds.—Retreat of Black Hawk.—Treaty of 1804 Re-affirmed.—Bad Faith of the Indians.—Invasion of 1832.—Volunteers Called For.—Abraham Lincoln one of a Company from Menard County.—He is chosen Captain.—Rendezvous at Beardstown.—Hard Marches across the Country to Oquawka, Prophetstown, and Dixon.—Expected Battle Avoided by the Enemy.—Discontent among Volunteers.—They are Disbanded.—Captain Lincoln Remains, Volunteering for Another Term of Service.—Skirmishing Fights.—Arrival of New Levies.—Encounter at Kellogg's Grove.—Black-Hawk at the Four Lakes.—He Retreats.—Battle on the Wisconsin.—Hastens Forward to the Mississippi.—Battle of the Bad-Ax.—End of Lincoln's First Campaign.—Autobiographic Note.

WHILE Abraham Lincoln was quietly performing his duties in the pioneer "store," in Menard county, reports were received of an alarming Indian invasion, on the western border of the State. In the spring of 1831, while he was employed in his excursion down the Mississippi, the noted Black-Hawk, an old chief of the Sac tribe of Indians, repudiating the treaty by the terms of which they had been removed beyond the Father of Waters, re-crossed the river with his women and children, and three hundred warriors of the Sacs, together with allies from the Kickapoo and Pottawatomie nations. His object was again to take possession of his old hunting-grounds, and to establish himself where the principal village of his nation before had been, in the Rock-river country. The Indians began committing depredations upon the property of the white settlers, destroying their crops, pulling down their fences, driving off and slaughtering their cattle, and ordering the settlers themselves to leave, under penalty of being massacred.

In response to the representations of Gov. Reynolds, to whom the settlers applied for protection, Gen. Gaines, commander of the United States forces in that quarter, took prompt and decisive measures to expel these invaders from the State. With a few companies of regular soldiers, Gen. Gaines at once took up his position at Rock Island, and at his call, several hundred volunteers, assembled from the northern and central parts of the State, upon the proclamation of Gov. Reynolds, joined him a month later. His little army, distributed into two regiments, an additional battalion, and a spy battalion, was the most formidable military force yet seen in the new State. The expected battle did not take place, the Indians having suddenly and stealthily retired again, in their canoes, across the river. The troops had been advanced to Vandruff's Island, opposite the Indian town, where the engagement was anticipated, and there was much dissatisfaction among the volunteers, and some complaints against the generals, Gaines and Duncan, for permitting the enemy to escape.

Whether or not either of these commanders was chargeable with blame, this retreat of Black Hawk only prolonged the difficulties impending, and prepared the way for a more formidable and eventful campaign, the next season. Gen. Gaines, however, had taken measures to preclude any such possibility, so far as the deliberate engagements of the uneasy chief could avail for that purpose. Intimidated by the threats of Gaines to cross the river, and to prosecute the war on that ground, Black Hawk sued for peace. A treaty was entered into, by which he agreed that he and his tribe should ever after remain on the west side of the river, unless by permission of the State Governor, or of the President. Thus was the treaty of 1804 reaffirmed, by which the lands they were claiming had been distinctly conveyed to the United States Government, which, in turn, had sold them to the present settlers.

In express violation, however, of this second deliberate engagement, Black Hawk and his followers began, early in the spring of 1832, as we have seen, to make preparations for another invasion. Many and grievous wrongs have undoubtedly been inflicted upon the savage tribes, by the superior race

that has gradually, but steadily driven the former from their ancient homes. But the bad faith shown in this case, and the repeated violation of deliberate and voluntary agreements, was wholly without justification or excuse. No provocation or plausible pretext had arisen after the treaty of the previous June; yet Black Hawk, under the misguided influence and false representations of the "Prophet," who persuaded him to believe that even the British (to whom Black Hawk had always been a fast friend), as well as the Ottawas, Chippewas, Winnebagoes and Pottawatomies, would aid them in regaining their village and the adjoining lands. Under this delusion, to which the wiser Keokuk refused to become a dupe, though earnestly invited to join them, Black Hawk proceeded to gather as strong a force as possible. He first established his headquarters at the old site of Fort Madison, west of the Mississippi. After his preparations, of which the people of Illinois were advised, had been completed, he proceeded up the river with his women and children, his property and camp equipage, in canoes, while his warriors, armed and mounted, advanced by land. In spite of a warning he had received that there was a strong force of white soldiers at Fort Armstrong, on Rock Island, he continued on to the mouth of Rock river, where, in utter recklessness and bad faith—paying not the slightest regard to his solemn agreement of the last year—the whole party crossed to the east side of the Mississippi, with a declared purpose of ascending Rock river to the territory of the Winnebagoes. This was in the early part of April, 1832. Black Hawk, after he had gone some distance up this latter river, was overtaken by a messenger from Gen. Atkinson, who had command of the troops on Rock Island, and ordered to return beyond the Mississippi. This was defiantly refused.

Gov. Reynolds again issued a call for volunteers to protect the settlers from this invasion. A company was promptly raised in Menard county, in the formation of which, Abraham Lincoln was one of the most active. From New Salem, Clary's Grove, and elsewhere in the vicinity, an efficient force was gathered, and in making their organization, Lincoln was elected Captain—and this was the first promotion he had ever

received by the suffrages of his fellows, and one that afforded particular satisfaction to his not unaspiring, though modest spirit.

Their first march was to the rendezvous appointed by Gov. Reynolds, at Beardstown, one of the earlier settlements on the Illinois river, forty miles west of New Salem. Here eighteen hundred men were speedily assembled, under the direction of the Governor. The forces were organized into four regiments, with an additional spy battalion. Gen. Samuel Whiteside, of the State militia, who had commanded the spy battalion in the campaign of the previous year, was now intrusted with the command of the whole brigade. Gen. James D. Henry was placed at the head of the spy battalion.

This little army, a more imposing force than that of the preceding year, set out from Beardstown on the 27th of April, for the scene of action. Three or four days' hard marching across the country brought the volunteers to Oquawka, on the Mississippi, from whence they proceeded, without delay, northward to the mouth of Rock river. Here it was arranged with Gen. Atkinson, commander of the regulars, that the volunteer force should march up the latter stream a distance of about fifty miles, to Prophetstown, where they were to encamp, awaiting the arrival of the regulars, with provisions, by the river. Gen. Whiteside, however, instead of following out this plan, set fire to the Prophet's village, on arriving, and pushed forward toward Dixon's Ferry, forty miles further up the river.

These incessant marches must have severely taxed the endurance of many of the inexperienced soldiers, but to Capt. Lincoln, reared as he had been, they rather heightened the exhilaration which attended these adventures from the start. The prospect of speedily overtaking and encountering the enemy in battle, and the hope of winning, in the fight, some special honors for the little contingent under his command, relieved the sense of fatigue. A short distance below Dixon's Ferry, it was ordered that the baggage-wagons should be left behind, and that a forced march should be made upon that place. Arrived there, Gen. Whiteside halted, and sent

out scouting parties to ascertain the position and condition of the enemy. Here two battalions of mounted volunteers, numbering two hundred and seventy-five men, joined them from McLean, Peoria, and other counties, eager to distinguish themselves by participating in the war. Some of these fiery spirits, advancing without orders, and having no other duty assigned them than that of scouts, had a little skirmish on the 12th of May, a mile distant from their encampment, in Ogle county, with a number of mounted Indians, in which three of the latter were killed. Black Hawk and his principal forces were not far off, and rallying seven hundred men, he promptly repelled the assaults of these scouts, pursuing them in a disorderly condition, to their camp. These rash adventurers now showed greater eagerness in flight, than they had before to gain distinction in battle, and ran helter-skelter over the prairie, producing such confusion and dismay as to render it difficult to prevent the most serious effects from their subordinate conduct. As it was, eleven of the men were killed, the confidence of the Indians was greatly raised, and the survivors, who came straggling into the camp of General Whiteside, were full of panic, anticipating an immediate and general attack from their pursuers. Such was "Stillman's defeat."

The consequence of this affair was a council of war at the tent of the commander-in-chief, and a decision to march, early next morning, to the scene of that evening's misadventure. The great battle which Capt. Lincoln and his fellow-volunteers had come so far to participate in, seemed now on the point of becoming a reality. Notwithstanding the premature advance of Whiteside from Prophetstown had left them without the necessary supplies, and subjected them to the privations so well known to experienced soldiers, yet seldom encountered so early in a campaign, they made up for the absence of their regular provisions as best they might, and were ready, with the dawn, for the day's undertaking. But their enemy did not await their coming. Arrived at the scene of yesterday's skirmish and flight, they found not a straggler of all the savage forces. They had partly gone further up the river, and partly dispersed, to commit depredations in the

surrounding country. One party of them came suddenly upon a settlement near Ottawa, and massacred fifteen persons, carrying two young women into captivity. This circumstance alone is sufficient to show how utterly unfounded was the pretense of some that Black Hawk had no hostile purpose, in this repudiation of his treaty engagements, and to remove any ground for the mistaken sympathy which many have expended upon him.

After this energetic but vain attempt to fall in with the enemy and give him battle, Gen. Whiteside, having buried the dead of the day before, returned to camp, where he was joined, next day, by Gen. Atkinson, with his troops and supplies. The numbers of the army were thus increased to twenty-four hundred, and a few weeks more would have enabled this force to bring the war to a successful close. But many of the volunteers, whose time had nearly expired, were eager to be discharged. They had seen quite enough of the hardships of a campaign, which, without bringing as yet any glory, had turned out in reality quite different from what their imaginations had foretold. With the prevailing discontents, but one course was possible. The volunteers were marched to Ottawa, where they were discharged by Gov. Reynolds, on the 27th and 28th of May.

This sudden disbanding, without a battle, and with no results accomplished, was a disappointment to the young captain from Menard county. Gov. Reynolds had previously issued a call for two thousand new volunteers, to assemble at Beardstown and Hennepin. In accordance with the wishes of Lincoln and others, who were still ready to bear their share of the campaign, to its close, the Governor also asked for the formation of a volunteer regiment from those just discharged. Lincoln promptly enrolled himself as a private, as did also General Whiteside.

Before the arrival of the other levies, a skirmishing fight with the Indians was had at Burr Oak Grove, on the 18th of June, in which the enemy was defeated, with considerable loss, and on the side of the volunteers, two killed and one wounded.

The Winnebagoes and Pottawatomies now showed a decidedly hostile disposition toward the whites, and an inclination to join the movement of Black Hawk. Accordingly, with the appearance of the new levies, which had been divided into three regiments, and their junction with the regular and volunteer forces already in the field—the whole number of volunteers alone being thirty-two hundred—the army was placed in a formidable and effective attitude for offensive warfare. Meantime the Indian atrocities continued, their acts of signal treachery and cruelty rendering an efficient prosecution of the war, to its termination, indispensable. Galena, then a village of about four hundred inhabitants, was surrounded by the desperate enemy, and in imminent danger of attack. Apple River Fort, twelve miles from Galena, had already been made the object of a fierce and persevering attack, by Black Hawk himself and a hundred and fifty of his warriors, and obstinately defended by twenty-five men, during fifteen hours of constant fighting, ending with the retreat of the Indians, with no slight loss. Within the fort, one man was killed and another wounded. Straggling parties of Indians, at various points, made attacks upon the whites, producing constant alarm and excitement, through that part of the country.

The new forces, under command of Gen. Atkinson, of the regular army, were at length put in motion, detachments being sent out in different directions. A severe fight was had at Kellogg's Grove, in the midst of the Indian country, on the 25th of June, resulting in the retreat of the Indians, with much loss. Five whites were killed, and three wounded. A detachment under Gen. Alexander was stationed in a position to intercept the Indians, should they attempt to recross the Mississippi.

Meanwhile, it was understood that Black Hawk had concentrated his forces, in a fortified position, at the Four Lakes, awaiting the issue of a general battle. Gen. Atkinson moved in that direction, with all possible celerity, and encamped a mile above Turtle Village, on the open prairie, not far from Rock river, on the 30th of June. The appearance of hostile Indians, prowling around his encampment, showed that their progress

was watched, but they were not attacked. Next day, with numerous reinforcements, Gen. Atkinson's troops reached Burnt Village, a Winnebago town on the Whitewater river. They were now in a strange country, in which, for want of correct information, they were obliged to advance slowly and cautiously. There were traces of hostile Indians in the vicinity, and next day two soldiers, at a little distance from the camp, were fired upon by them, and one seriously wounded. But from this point it was difficult to discover the trail of the enemy.

Nearly two months had now passed since the opening of the campaign, and its purpose seemed as remote from accomplishment as ever. The new volunteers had many of them become discontented, like the former ones. Their number had in fact become reduced one-half. The wearisome marches, the delays, the privations and exposures, had proved to them that this service was no pastime, and that its romance was not what it seemed in the distance. They sickened of such service, and were glad to escape from its restraints. Not so, however, with Lincoln, who had found in reality the kind of exciting adventure which his spirit craved. While others murmured, and took their departure, he remained true and persistent, no less eager for the fray, or ambitious to play a genuine soldier's part, than at the beginning. To him it had been what his imagination painted, and he had a hearty earnestness in his work that kept him cheerful, and strongly attached others to him.

It was not destined, however, that he should be actively engaged in any battle more serious than those encounters already mentioned. The forces were divided and dispersed in different directions, on the 10th of July, with a view to obtaining supplies. Two days later, news was received that Black Hawk was thirty-five miles above Gen. Atkinson, on Rock river. A plan of Generals Alexander, Henry, and others, to take him by surprise, without awaiting orders, was frustrated by their troops refusing to follow them. Gen. Henry finally set out in pursuit of the Indians, on the 15th of July, but was misled by treachery. He continued on for several days,

acquiring better information, passing the beautiful country around the Four Lakes, the present site of Madison, Wisconsin, and after another day's hard march came close upon the retreating Indians, and finally overtook them on the 21st. They were immediately charged upon, and driven along the high bluffs of the Wisconsin, and down upon the river bottom. The Indians lost sixty-eight killed, and of the large number wounded, twenty-five were afterward found dead on their trail leading to the Mississippi. The regulars, in this engagement on the Wisconsin, were commanded by Gen. (then Col.) ZACHARY TAYLOR, afterward President of the United States. Gen. Henry, of Illinois, and Col. Dodge (afterward United States Senator), were chief commanders of the volunteers.

Waiting two days at the Blue Mounds, the forces still in the field were all united, and a hard pursuit resumed through the forests, down the Wisconsin. On the fourth day, they reached the Mississippi, which some of the Indians had already crossed, while the others were preparing to do so. The battle of the Bad-Ax here brought the war to a close, with the capture of Black Hawk and his surviving warriors.

Mr. Lincoln, as yet a youth of but twenty-three, faithfully discharged his duty to his country, as a soldier, persevering amid peculiar hardships, and against the influences of older men around him, during the three months' service of this his first and last military campaign.

Sarcastically commenting on the efforts of Gen. Cass's biographers to render him conspicuous as a military hero, Mr. Lincoln, in a Congressional speech, delivered during the canvass of 1848, made a humorous and characteristic reference to his own experiences as a soldier. We give his language on this occasion, as a suitable pendant to our sketch of this period of Mr. Lincoln's youth :

"By the way, Mr. Speaker, did you know I am a military hero? Yes, sir, in the days of the Black Hawk war, I fought, bled, and came away. Speaking of Gen. Cass's career, reminds me of my own. I was not at Stillman's defeat, but I was about as near it as Cass to Hull's surrender; and like him, I saw the place very soon afterward. It is quite certain I did

not break my sword, for I had none to break ; but I bent a musket pretty badly on one occasion. If Cass broke his sword, the idea is, he broke it in desperation ; I bent the musket by accident. If Gen. Cass went in advance of me in picking whortleberries, I guess I surpassed him in charges upon the wild onions. If he saw any live, fighting Indians, it was more than I did, but I had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes ; and although I never fainted from loss of blood, I can truly say I was often very hungry.

“ Mr. Speaker, if I should ever conclude to doff whatever our Democratic friends may suppose there is of black-cockade Federalism about me, and, thereupon, they should take me up as their candidate for the Presidency, I protest they shall not make fun of me as they have of Gen. Cass, by attempting to write me into a military hero.”

CHAPTER V.

EIGHT YEARS IN THE LEGISLATURE OF ILLINOIS—1834-41.

A New Period in Mr. Lincoln's Life.—His Political Opinions.—Clay and Jackson.—His first Run as a Candidate for Representative.—His Election in 1834.—Illinois Strongly Democratic.—Mr. Lincoln as a Surveyor.—Land Speculation Mania.—Mr. Lincoln's First Appearance in the Legislature.—Banks and Internal Improvements.—Whig Measures Democratically Botched.—First Meeting of Lincoln with Douglas.—The Latter Seeks an Office of the Legislature and Gets it.—Mr. Lincoln Re-elected in 1836.—Mr. Douglas also a Member of the House.—Distinguished Associates.—Internal Improvements Again.—Mr. Lincoln's Views on Slavery.—The Capital Removed to Springfield.—The New Metropolis.—The Revulsion of 1837.—Mr. Lincoln Chosen for a Third Term.—John Calhoun of Lecompton Memory.—Lincoln the Whig Leader, and Candidate for Speaker.—Close Vote.—First Session at Springfield.—Lincoln Re-elected in 1840.—Partizan Remodeling of the Supreme Court.—Lincoln Declines Further Service in the Legislature.—His Position as a Statesman at the Close of this Period.—A Tribune of the People.

WE now approach the period of Mr. Lincoln's transition to the more natural position in which, as a professional man and a statesman, he was to attain that success and eminence for which his rare endowments fitted him. Hitherto, he had been unconsciously undergoing a varied training, the whole tendency of which, if rightly subjected afterward to a high purpose in life, could not fail to be advantageous. He had learned much of the world, and of men, and gained some true knowledge of himself. The discipline of those hard years of toil and penury, so manfully and cheerfully gone through with, was of more value to him, as time was to prove, than any heritage of wealth or of ancestral eminence could have been. Still the conflict with an adverse fortune was to continue; but from this time

onward, a more genial future began to shape itself in the hopes and aspirations of the self-reliant youth. His later experiences had shown him more clearly that he was not to be a mere private in the great battle of life, but that he had certain qualities which could place him at the head of a column or of a brigade, if he were so minded. Nor was he indifferent to the good opinion of his fellow-men. The confessed satisfaction which the captaincy of a company of volunteers had given him, as the expressed preference of a hundred or two of associates for him above all others, as a leader, showed that, however distrustful as yet of his own powers, he was not without ambition, or unable to appreciate popular honors.

This campaign likewise, besides the excitements of varied adventure which it afforded, so much to his natural inclination, had brought him in contact with inspiring influences and associations, and had demonstrated, and doubtless improved, his powers of fixing the esteem and admiration of those around him. He had been, as is told of him, a wild sort of a boy, and in his peculiar way he had attached his associates to him to a remarkable degree. This will be seen from a circumstance to be presently related. His horizon had been enlarged and his dreams ennobled. Meantime, it is to be remembered, that he had come home from the Black Hawk war with no definite business to resort to, and still under a necessity of devoting his chief and immediate energies to self-support.

He has, then, reached a new epoch of his youth, at this date, and entered on another distinct period of his history. Proof of this we shall find in the fact that he became, on returning home, a candidate for representative in the State Legislature, the election of which was close at hand. A youth of twenty-three, and not at all generally known through the county, or able, in the brief time allowed, to make himself so, it may have an appearance of presumption for him to have allowed the use of his name as a candidate. He was not elected, certainly, and could hardly have thought such an event possible; yet the noticeable fact remains that he received so wonderful a vote in his own precinct, where he was best if not almost exclusively known, as may almost be said to

have made his fortune. His precinct (he had now settled in Sangamon county) was strongly for Jackson, while Lincoln had, from the start, warmly espoused the cause of Henry Clay. The State election occurred in August, and the Presidential election two or three months later, the same season. Political feeling ran high, at this the second election (as it proved) of Jackson. Notwithstanding this, such was the popularity which young Lincoln had brought home with him from the war, that out of the two hundred and eighty-four votes cast in his precinct, two hundred and seventy-seven—the entire vote wanting seven—were cast for him. Yet, a little later in the same canvass, Gen. Jackson received a majority of one hundred and fifty-five for the Presidency, from the very same men, over Mr. Clay, whose cause Lincoln was known to favor. So marked an indication as this of his personal power to draw votes, made him a political celebrity at once. In future elections it became a point with aspirants to seek to combine his strength in their favor, by placing Lincoln's name on their ticket, to secure his battalion of voters. When he was elected to the Legislature for the first time, two years later, his majority ranged about two hundred votes higher than the rest of the ticket on which he ran.

Such was the beginning of Mr. Lincoln's political life, almost in his boyhood. This is the proper place to pause and review, in a brief way, the state of political affairs in Illinois, at the time of his first appearance upon this public arena. We shall find the revolution which has been wrought—Mr. Lincoln, though for long years in an apparently hopeless minority in the State, having been always a foremost leader on the side opposed to the Democracy—to be scarcely less remarkable than his youthful successes at the polls.

At the date of Mr. Lincoln's arrival—when just of age—in the State of Illinois, Gen. Jackson was in the midst of his first Presidential term. Since 1826 every general election in that State had resulted decisively in favor of his friends. In August, 1830, the first election after Lincoln became a resident of the State, and before he was a qualified voter, the only rival candidates for Governor, were both of the same

strongly predominant party. The Legislature then elected had a large majority on that side: In 1832, Gen. Jackson received the electoral vote of Illinois, for the second time, by a decisive majority. The Legislature of 1834 was so strongly Democratic, that the Whig members did not have any candidates of their own, in organizing the House, but chose rather to exercise the little power they had in favor of such Democratic candidate as they preferred. Against such odds, as we shall see, the opponents of that party struggled long and in vain. Even the great political tornado which swept over so large a portion of the Union in 1840, made no decisive impression upon Illinois. In spite of all these difficulties and discouragements, Mr. Lincoln adhered steadily to his faith, never once dreaming of seeking profit in compliance, or in a compromise of his honest principles. Henry Clay was his model as a statesman, and always continued such, while any issues were left to contend for, of the celebrated American system of the great Kentuckian.

During the time Mr. Lincoln was pursuing his law studies, and making his first practical acquaintance with political life, he turned his attention to the business of a surveyor as a means of support. The mania for speculation in Western lands and lots was beginning to spread over the country at this time; and while our young student of law had neither means nor inclination to embark in any such enterprise for himself, it was the means of bringing him some profitable employment with the chain and compass. From the earliest grand center of these operations in land and town lots, Chicago, which had also itself furnished, even then, most remarkable examples of fortunes easily made, the contagion spread everywhere through the State. Towns and cities without number were laid out in all directions, and innumerable fortunes were made, in anticipation, by the purchase of lots in all sorts of imaginary cities, during the four or five years preceding the memorable crisis and crash of 1837. It was during the year previous to that consummation, that this business had reached its height in Illinois. With the revulsion, came also a brief period of adversity to the successful surveyor, whose occupation was now

gone. It is said that even his surveying instruments were sold under the hammer. But this change only served to establish him more exclusively and permanently in his profession of the law.

Mr. Lincoln's first election to the Illinois Legislature, as has been stated, was in 1834. His associates on the ticket were Major John T. Stuart (two or three years later elected to Congress), John Dawson and William Carpenter. All were decided Clay men, or, as the party in that State was first styled, Democratic Republicans. About this time, the name of Whigs had begun to be their current designation. Lincoln was the youngest member of this Legislature, with the single exception of Hon. Jesse K. Dubois, of Lawrence county, now Auditor of State in Illinois, who served with him during his entire legislative career. He had not yet acquired position as a lawyer, or even been admitted to the bar, and had his reputation to make, no less, as a politician and orator. At this time he was very plain in his costume, as well as rather uncourtly in his address and general appearance. His clothing was of homely Kentucky jean, and the first impression made by his tall, lank figure, upon those who saw him, was not specially prepossessing. He had not outgrown his hard backwoods experience, and showed no inclination to disguise or to cast behind him the honest and manly, though unpolished characteristics of his earlier days. Never was a man further removed from all snobbish affectation. As little was there, also, of the demagogue art of assuming an uncouthness or rusticity of manner and outward habit, with the mistaken notion of thus securing particular favor as "one of the masses." He chose to appear then, as he has at all times since, precisely what he was. His deportment was unassuming, though without any awkwardness of reserve.

During this, his first session in the Legislature, he was taking lessons, as became his youth and inexperience, and preparing himself for the future, by close observation and attention to business, rather than by a prominent participation in debate. He seldom or never took the floor to speak, although before the close of this and the succeeding special session of the same Legislature, he had shown, as previously

in every other capacity in which he was engaged, qualities that clearly pointed to him as fitted to act a leading part. One of his associates from Sangamon county, Maj. Stuart, was now the most prominent member on the Whig side of the House.

The organization of this Legislature was of course in the hands of the Democrats. The Speaker was Hon. James Semple, afterward United States Senator. In the selection of his committees, he assigned Lincoln the second place on the Committee on Public Accounts and Expenditures, as if with an intuition, in advance of acquaintance, of the propriety of setting "Honest Abe" to look after the public treasury.

Hon. Joseph Duncan, then a member of Congress, had been elected Governor at the same time this Legislature was chosen, over Mr. Kinney, also a Democrat, and of what was then termed the "whole hog" Jackson school. Notwithstanding the strong preponderance of the Democrats in both branches of the Legislature, and in the State, it is noticeable that in the distinguishing measures of Whig policy, in this as in subsequent years, the minority found their principles repeatedly in the ascendant, though unable to control the details of their practical application. This was true more particularly in regard to banks and internal improvements. Though inferior in numbers, the Whigs had superiority in ability, and in the real popularity and genuine democracy of their doctrines.

General attention had now come to be strongly fixed upon the remarkable natural advantages and resources of the new State of Illinois. Land speculation, as we have seen, had already begun to bring in Eastern money, and the population was rapidly increasing. According to the Whig policy, it now became desirable that every proper and reasonable legislative aid should be afforded to further the development of the latent power of this young commonwealth, and its progress toward the high rank among the States of the Mississippi valley, which had been indicated and provided for by nature. Despite the strong Democratic predominancy in this Legislature, therefore, a new State bank, with a capital of one million and five hundred thousand dollars, was incorporated, and the Illinois bank at Shawneetown, which had suspended for twelve years, was

rechartered, with a capital of three hundred thousand dollars. It is to be noticed, however, that this bank legislation, just like that of many other States, similarly circumstanced, while it fully indorsed the Whig policy, in its fundamental principle, was by no means so skillfully done or so safely guarded as it should have been, and habitually was done in those States where the Whigs were in the ascendant. Whatever troubles have accrued in Illinois, under this head, have been chiefly due to the fact that Whig measures were not rightly shaped and executed by Democratic hands. Whig measures, framed and carried out by Democrats, have too often ended in a mere botch. At the same time, it is observable that these imperfect, yet plausible concessions to the public welfare, have often saved the Democratic party, at the expense of the real interest involved. The State bank charter passed the House of Representatives by one majority.

This Legislature also gave some attention to what are technically called internal improvements within the State. In behalf of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, the company for constructing which had been incorporated in 1825, a loan was agitated at the first session. Congress had granted for this work, in 1826, about 300,000 acres of land on the proposed route of the canal. But for a special message of Gov. Duncan, maintaining that the desired loan could be effected on a pledge of these canal lands alone, it is probable that the loan bill, reported by a Senator from Sangamon county, named George Forquer, would have passed. At the next session, in 1835, this measure was carried, a bill pledging the credit of the State in behalf of the Canal Company, to the amount originally proposed, having become a law. The loan was negotiated by Gov. Duncan the next year, and the work on this important canal was commenced in June, 1836. At the same special session, a large number of railroads, without State aid, were chartered, including the Illinois Central and the Galena and Chicago routes.

It is hardly necessary to state more distinctly that these measures, securing, with all the defects of their origin, immense benefits to the people of Illinois, and in their spirit accordant with the great principles of the "American system," were sup-

ported by Mr. Lincoln and his Whig associates. Not what they desired, these measures were yet the nearest approach to their wishes that could be obtained of the majority.

It was during the regular session of this Legislature, that Stephen A. Douglas, not himself a member, became first known to Mr. Lincoln. Late in the year 1833, Mr. Douglas, then in his twenty-first year, had migrated to Illinois (Vermont being his native State), and commenced teaching a district school in Winchester, Scott county. During the succeeding year, he gave a portion of his time to the study of law, taking part also in the political affairs of his locality. The Legislature, at this session, had taken from the Governor the power of appointing State's attorneys for the several judicial districts, and provided that these officers should be elected by the Legislature, in joint convention. Though he had been but a little more than a year in the State, and was scarcely to be regarded as an expert in the profession of the law, Mr. Douglas presented himself before the Legislature as a candidate for State's attorney for the first judicial district, against Mr. Hardin, a distinguished lawyer, then in office. The movement was so adroit, that the youthful advocate distanced his unsuspecting competitor, receiving thirty-eight votes to thirty-six cast against him. At this time, young Douglas was as thin in flesh as he is short in stature. Mr. Lincoln has since remarked, that on this the first occasion of their meeting, Douglas "had no flesh on him," and was physically "the least man he ever saw."

In 1836, Mr. Lincoln was elected for a second term, as one of the seven representatives from Sangamon county. Among his associates were Mr. Dawson, re-elected, and Ninian W. Edwards. Mr. Douglas was one of the representatives from Morgan county (to which he had recently removed), and along with him Mr. Hardin, whom he had managed to supersede as State's attorney in 1835. The latter (who was subsequently in Congress, and who fell at Buena Vista) was the only Whig elected from that county, the other five representatives being Democrats. This canvass in Morgan county is memorable for introducing in Illinois, through the aid of Douglas, the convention system, the benefit of which he was subsequently

to reap in the local contests of that State. He had been put on the representative ticket to fill a vacancy occasioned by the declinature of one of the candidates, having failed himself in this instance to secure a nomination from the convention. He was never again elected to the Legislature, having in fact vacated his seat after the first session, and accepted the federal appointment of Register in the land office at Springfield.

In this body, as in that which immediately preceded, the Democrats had a decided majority. Gen. Semple was re-elected Speaker. Mr. Lincoln was assigned a place on the Committee of Finance. In addition to those we have already named, the House included many men of ability, who have been distinguished in the politics of the State or of the nation, among whom were James Shields, Augustus C. French, Robert Smith, John Dougherty, W. A. Richardson, and John A. McClernand. At the two sessions of this Legislature, in 1836 and '37, Mr. Lincoln came forward more prominently in debate, gradually becoming recognized as the leading man on the Whig side.

The subject of internal improvements became one of the most prominent ones before this Legislature, as had happened with the last. Of this policy, in a judiciously guarded form, Mr. Lincoln had been from the first a staunch and efficient advocate. He held it to be the duty of Government to extend its fostering aid, in every Constitutional way, and to a reasonable extent, to whatever enterprise of public utility required such assistance, in order to the fullest development of the natural resources, and to the most rapid healthful growth of the State. The Democratic party, while professing the let-alone (*laissez-faire*) principle in general, was compelled to follow pretty closely in the wake of its adversary, in some of its most distinctive features of public policy. The question of internal improvements was one of these. And while the Democrats had a decided majority of the members of each House, it was understood that, by the aid of pledges made contrary to Democratic teaching in general, a majority for liberal legislation in regard to internal improvements had likewise been secured. The business, in fact, under the grand excitement of

the flush times of 1836, was somewhat overdone, and through subsequent mismanagement and the revulsion of the next year, matters were eventually made still worse. The voice of the people was overwhelmingly in favor of the legislation which was granted. Even Whigs like Mr. Lincoln, were outstripped by some ardent Democrats—Mr. Douglas among them—in zeal for these improvements; they having unfortunately, as noticed in the case of bank-legislation, in appropriating the principle, failed to understand its most skillful and safe application in practice.

At the first session of 1836-7, about 1,300 miles of railroad were provided for, in various quarters, the completion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, from Chicago to Peru, and the improvement of the navigation of the Kaskaskia, Illinois, Rock, and Great and Little Wabash rivers; requiring in all a loan of \$8,000,000. This included the novel appropriation of \$200,000 to be distributed among those counties through which none of the proposed improvements were to be made. The system voted by the Legislature was on a most magnificent scale, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio or Indiana had not surpassed. This system of internal improvement, with Democratic variations, having scarcely been inaugurated when the crash of 1837 came, did not entirely correspond in practice with what it had promised in theory.

There was also a considerable addition made to the banking capital of the State at this session.

During the winter, resolutions of an extreme Southern character, on the slavery question, were introduced, and, after discussion, adopted by the Democratic majority. The attempt was, of course, made to affix a character of abolitionism to all those who refused assent to these extreme views. At that time, the public sentiment of the North was not aroused on the subject, as it became a few years later, in consequence of pro-slavery aggressions. Yet Mr. Lincoln refused to vote for these resolutions, and exercised his Constitutional privilege, along with one of his colleagues from Sangamon county, of entering upon the Journal of the House his reasons for thus acting. As showing his sentiments twenty-three years ago,

on this now so prominent national question, the protest referred to, as it appears on the journal, is here appended in full :

MARCH 3d, 1837.

The following protest was presented to the House, which was read and ordered to be spread on the journals, to wit :

"Resolutions upon the subject of domestic slavery having passed both branches of the General Assembly, at its present session, the undersigned hereby protest against the passage of the same.

"They believe that the institution of slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy ; but that the promulgation of abolition doctrines tends rather to increase than abate its evils.

"They believe that the Congress of the United States has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the different States.

"They believe that the Congress of the United States has the power, under the Constitution, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia ; but that the power ought not to be exercised, unless at the request of the people of said District.

"The difference between these opinions and those contained in the said resolutions, is their reason for entering this protest.

"(Signed)

"DAN STONE,

"A. LINCOLN,

"Representatives from the County of Sangamon."

On the formation of the separate Territory of Illinois, in 1809, Kaskaskia, perhaps the oldest town in all the Western country, had been designated as the capital. Such it continued to be until Illinois was admitted into the Union as a State, in 1818, when Vandalia, far up the Kaskaskia river, was laid out as the new capital. For some time it continued to be relatively a central location. But during several years preceding 1837, the middle and northern portions of the State had filled so rapidly that the propriety of a removal of the capital to a point nearer the geographical center had become manifestly expedient. At this session, accordingly, an act was passed changing the seat of government to Springfield, the principal town in the interior of the State, from and after the 4th day of July, 1839. To the people of Sangamon county, whom Mr. Lincoln represented, this was of course a

most satisfactory measure, and by the State at large it was received with general approbation. Vandalia, which had reached a population of about two thousand, dwindled away for a time, until it had but about one-fourth that number of inhabitants, though of late years it has revived. Springfield has steadily advanced, since this period, and is one of the most beautiful interior towns of the West. The prairie country for scores of miles around is as charming in appearance and as fertile in its productions as any tract of like extent on the face of the earth. It is greatly to the credit of Mr. Lincoln's good taste and sagacity that, when he came to his majority, he fixed upon such a locality for his home, foreseeing for this spot a successful future, to which (altogether beyond his anticipation) his influence, in 1836, added a material advantage, and his presence, in 1860, gives a national luster of renown.

The financial disasters of the spring of 1837, were the occasion of an extra session of the Legislature of Illinois in July of that year. The Governor asked for the legalization of the suspension of specie payments by the banks of the State, which a majority of both Houses granted. He also asked a repeal or modification of the internal improvement system, which was refused. The condition of affairs was deemed critical, and particularly so to the prospects of the Democratic party, which had just been congratulating itself on the election and inauguration of the successor of Gen. Jackson, Martin Van Buren, as President. In Illinois, that party had held unbroken and decisive sway, from the days of the younger Adams down. Whatever looseness of legislation had contributed to these evils at home, they were responsible for. And in the nation, the political dangers were felt to be imminent—so much so that the President had called an extra session of Congress. There was a want of Democratic harmony, however, at Washington and at Vandalia. The doctors of the party sat in council at the latter place, during the special session, but in the Legislature they only accomplished what has been stated. It now required the most desperate exertions to save the Democracy from defeat, and the

Whigs actively followed up their advantages. So overwhelming had been the strength of their opponents, however, from the time that Mr. Lincoln first appeared on the political stage, and long before, that, while a great change was visible in the results of the next election, the revolution was not yet to be completed.

In 1838, Mr. Lincoln was for the third time elected a representative in the Legislature, for the two years ensuing. Among the other six representatives of Sangamon county was John Calhoun, since notorious for his connection with the Lecompton Constitution. Availing himself of some local issue or other, and being a man of conceded ability, of highly respectable Whig antecedents and connections, he had slipped in by a small majority, crowding out the lowest candidate on the Whig ticket. The remaining five were Whigs, including E. D. Baker, Ninian W. Edwards, and A. McCormick. The strength of the two parties in the House was nearly evenly balanced, the Democrats having only three or four majority, rendering this unexpected gain particularly acceptable.

So well recognized was now the position of Mr. Lincoln in his party that, by general consent, he received the Whig vote for the Speakership. There was a close contest, his Democratic competitor being Col. William Lee D. Ewing, who had served with Lincoln in the Black Hawk war. On the fourth ballot, Ewing had a majority of one over all others, two Whigs (including Mr. Lincoln) and two Democrats having scattered their votes.

At the State election, in August, 1838, the Whig candidate for Governor made an excellent run, but was defeated by Thomas Carlin, Democrat. State affairs were hardly brought in issue in the general canvass. A majority of the Legislature, at the first session, was opposed to the repeal or modification of the public works system, but voted additional expenditures thereon, to the amount of \$800,000. At a special session, however, this body repealed the system, and made provisions for its gradual winding up. Mr. Lincoln, as the Whig leader, had his position on the Committee on Finance, and exerted his influence in favor of wise counsels,

and such a determination of affairs as would best remedy the evils resulting from this loose Democratic tampering with measures of Whig policy.

Aside from these financial questions, there were few matters of any general interest before this Legislature. This session of 1838-9 was the last held at Vandalia. A special session in 1839, inaugurated the new state-house at Springfield. The great contest of 1840 was already casting its shadow before, and began chiefly to engross the attention of persons in political life. Whig candidates for electors were nominated in November of this year, and discussions commenced in earnest. Mr. Lincoln who was deemed one of the strongest champions of the cause before the people, was repeatedly called on to encounter the foremost advocates of the Democratic party—what no man in Illinois, it was now manifest, could do more successfully.

For the fourth time in succession, Mr. Lincoln was elected to the Legislature in 1840—the last election to that position which he would consent to accept from his strongly attached constituents of Sangamon county. In this Legislature, like all previous ones in which he had served, the Democrats had a majority in both branches, and the responsibility of all legislation was with them. It was at this session that, to overrule a decision unacceptable to Democrats, and for political and personal reasons of common notoriety in Illinois, the judicial system of the State was changed, at the instigation of Douglas, against the judgment of many leading Democrats, and five new judges, of whom Mr. Douglas was one, were added to the Supreme Court of the State. This is now generally felt to be a measure conferring little credit upon those concerned in concocting the scheme, and was never heartily approved by the people.

There was but one session during the two years for which this Legislature was chosen. Mr. Lincoln, as in the last, was the acknowledged Whig leader, and the candidate of his party for Speaker. First elected at twenty-five, he had continued in office without interruption so long as his inclination allowed, and until, by his uniform courtesy and kindness of manners,

his marked ability, and his straight-forward integrity, he had won an enviable repute throughout the State, and was virtually, when but a little past thirty, placed at the head of his party in Illinois.

Begun in comparative obscurity, and without any adventitious aids in its progress, this period of his life, at its termination, had brought him to a position where he was secure in the confidence of the people, and prepared, in due time, to enter upon a more enlarged and brilliant career, as a national statesman. His fame as a close and convincing debater was established. His native talent as an orator had at once been demonstrated and disciplined. His zeal and earnestness in behalf of a party whose principles he believed to be right, had rallied strong troops of political friends about him, while his unfeigned modesty and his unpretending and simple bearing, in marked contrast with that of so many imperious leaders, had won him general and lasting esteem. He preferred no claim as a partizan, and showed no overweening anxiety to advance himself, but was always a disinterested and generous co-worker with his associates, only ready to accept the post of honor and of responsibility, when it was clearly their will, and satisfactory to the people whose interests were involved. At the close of this period, with scarcely any consciousness of the fact himself, and with no noisy demonstrations or flashy ostentation in his behalf from his friends, he was really one of the foremost political men in the State. A keen observer might even then have predicted a great future for the "Sangamon Chief," as people have been wont to call him; and only such an observer, perhaps, would then have adequately estimated his real power as a natural orator, a sagacious statesman, and a gallant TRIBUNE OF THE PEOPLE.

W.W.L.

1

CHAPTER VI.

HIS SETTLEMENT AT SPRINGFIELD AND HIS MARRIAGE.—1837-42.

Mr. Lincoln's Law Studies.—His Perseverance under Adverse Circumstances.—Licensed to Practice in 1836.—His Progress in his Profession.—His Qualities as an Advocate.—A Romantic and Exciting Incident in his Practice.—A Reminiscence of his Early Life.—He Renders a Material Service to the Family of an Old Friend.—Secures an Acquittal in a Murder Case, in Spite of a Strong Popular Prejudice Unjustly Excited Against the Prisoner.—An Affecting Scene.—Mr. Lincoln Removes to Springfield in 1837.—Devotes Himself to his Profession, Giving up Political Life.—His Marriage.—The Family of Mrs. Lincoln.—Fortunate Domestic Relations.—His Children and their Education.—Denominational Tendencies.—Four Years' Retirement.

DURING the time of his service in the Legislature, Mr. Lincoln was busily engaged in mastering the profession of law. This he was, indeed, compelled to do somewhat at intervals, and with many disadvantages, from the necessity he was under to support himself meanwhile by his own labor, to say nothing of the attention he was compelled to give to politics, by the position he had accepted. Nothing, however, could prevent his consummating his purpose. He completed his preliminary studies, and was licensed to practice in 1836. His reputation was now such that he found a good amount of business, and began to rise to the front rank in his profession. He was a most effective jury advocate, and manifested a ready perception and a sound judgment of the turning legal points of a case. His clear, practical sense, and his skill in homely or humorous illustration, were noticeable traits in his arguments. The graces and the cold artificialities of a polished rhetoric, he certainly had not, nor did he aim to acquire them. His style of expression and the cast of his thought were his own, having all the native force of a genuine originality.

The following incident, of which the narration is believed to be substantially accurate, is from the pen of one who professes to write from personal knowledge. It is given in this connection, as at once illustrating the earlier struggles of Mr. Lincoln in acquiring his profession, the character of his forensic efforts, and the generous gratitude and disinterestedness of his nature :

Having chosen the law as his future calling, he devoted himself assiduously to its mastery, contending at every step with adverse fortune. During this period of study, he for some time found a home under the hospitable roof of one Armstrong, a farmer, who lived in a log house some eight miles from the village of Petersburg, in Menard county. Here, young Lincoln would master his lessons by the firelight of the cabin, and then walk to town for the purpose of recitation. This man Armstrong was himself poor, but he saw the genius struggling in the young student, and opened to him his rude home, and bid him welcome to his coarse fare. How Lincoln graduated with promise—how he has more than fulfilled that promise—how honorably he acquitted himself, alike on the battle-field, in defending our border settlements against the ravages of savage foes, and in the halls of our national legislature, are matters of history, and need no repetition here. But one little incident, of a more private nature, standing as it does as a sort of sequel to some things already alluded to, I deem worthy of record. Some few years since, the oldest son of Mr. Lincoln's old friend Armstrong, the chief support of his widowed mother—the good old man having some time previously passed from earth—was arrested on the charge of murder. A young man had been killed during a riotous melee, in the night-time, at a camp-meeting, and one of his associates stated that the death-wound was inflicted by young Armstrong. A preliminary examination was gone into, at which the accuser testified so positively, that there seemed no doubt of the guilt of the prisoner, and therefore he was held for trial. As is too often the case, the bloody act caused an undue degree of excitement in the public mind. Every improper incident in the life of the prisoner—each act which bore the least semblance of rowdyism—each schoolboy quarrel—was suddenly remembered and magnified, until they pictured him as a fiend of the most horrid hue. As these rumors spread abroad, they were received as gospel truth, and a feverish desire for vengeance seized upon the infatuated populace, while only prison-bars prevented a horrible death at the

hands of a mob. The events were heralded in the newspapers, painted in highest colors, accompanied by rejoicing over the certainty of punishment being meted out to the guilty party. The prisoner, overwhelmed by the circumstances in which he found himself placed, fell into a melancholy condition, bordering upon despair; and the widowed mother, looking through her tears, saw no cause for hope from earthly aid.

At this juncture, the widow received a letter from Mr. Lincoln, volunteering his services in an effort to save the youth from the impending stroke. Gladly was his aid accepted, although it seemed impossible for even his sagacity to prevail in such a desperate case; but the heart of the attorney was in his work, and he set about it with a will that knew no such word as fail. Feeling that the poisoned condition of the public mind was such as to preclude the possibility of impanneling an impartial jury in the court having jurisdiction, he procured a change of venue, and a postponement of the trial. He then went studiously to work unraveling the history of the case, and satisfied himself that his client was the victim of malice, and that the statements of the accuser were a tissue of falsehoods. When the trial was called on, the prisoner, pale and emaciated, with hopelessness written on every feature, and accompanied by his half-hoping, half-despairing mother—whose only hope was in a mother's belief of her son's innocence, in the justice of the God she worshiped, and in the noble counsel, who, without hope of fee or reward upon earth, had undertaken the cause—took his seat in the prisoner's box, and with a "stony firmness" listened to the reading of the indictment.

Lincoln sat quietly by, while the large auditory looked on him as though wondering what he could say in defense of one whose guilt they regarded as certain. The examination of the witnesses for the State was begun, and a well-arranged mass of evidence, circumstantial and positive, was introduced, which seemed to impale the prisoner beyond the possibility of extrication. The counsel for the defense propounded but few questions, and those of a character which excited no uneasiness on the part of the prosecutor—merely, in most cases, requiring the main witness to be definite as to time and place. When the evidence of the prosecution was ended, Lincoln introduced a few witnesses to remove some erroneous impressions in regard to the previous character of his client, who, though somewhat rowdyish, had never been known to commit a vicious act; and to show that a greater degree of ill-feeling existed between the accuser and the accused, than the

accused and the deceased. The prosecutor felt that the case was a clear one, and his opening speech was brief and formal. Lincoln arose, while a deathly silence pervaded the vast audience, and in a clear but moderate tone began his argument. Slowly and carefully he reviewed the testimony, pointing out the hitherto unobserved discrepancies in the statements of the principal witness. That which had seemed plain and plausible, he made to appear crooked as a serpent's path. The witness had stated that the affair took place at a certain hour in the evening, and that, by the aid of the brightly shining moon, he saw the prisoner inflict the death-blow with a slung-shot. Mr. Lincoln showed, that at the hour referred to, the moon had not yet appeared above the horizon, and consequently the whole tale was a fabrication. An almost instantaneous change seemed to have been wrought in the minds of his auditors, and the verdict of "not guilty" was at the end of every tongue. But the advocate was not content with this intellectual achievement. His whole being had for months been bound up in this work of gratitude and mercy, and, as the lava of the overcharged crater bursts from its imprisonment, so great thoughts and burning words leaped forth from the soul of the eloquent Lincoln. He drew a picture of the perjurer, so horrid and ghastly that the accuser could sit under it no longer, but reeled and staggered from the court-room, while the audience fancied they could see the brand upon his brow. Then in words of thrilling pathos, Lincoln appealed to the jurors, as fathers of sons who might become fatherless, and as husbands of wives who might be widowed, to yield to no previous impressions, no ill-founded prejudice, but to do his client justice; and as he alluded to the debt of gratitude which he owed the boy's sire, tears were seen to fall from many eyes unused to weep. It was near night when he concluded by saying, that if justice was done—as he believed it would be—before the sun should set it would shine upon his client, a freeman. The jury retired, and the court adjourned for the day. Half an hour had not elapsed, when, as the officers of the court and the volunteer attorney sat at the tea-table of their hotel, a messenger announced that the jury had returned to their seats. All repaired immediately to the court-house, and while the prisoner was being brought from the jail, the court-room was filled to overflowing with citizens of the town. When the prisoner and his mother entered, silence reigned as completely as though the house were empty. The foreman of the jury, in answer to the usual inquiry from the court, delivered the verdict of "Not Guilty!" The widow dropped into the arms of her son, who lifted her up, and told her to look upon him as before, free

and innocent. Then, with the words, "Where is Mr. Lincoln?" he rushed across the room and grasped the hand of his deliverer, while his heart was too full for utterance. Lincoln turned his eyes toward the west, where the sun still lingered in view, and then, turning to the youth, said, "It is not yet sundown, and you are free." I confess that my cheeks were not wholly unwet by tears, and I turned from the affecting scene. As I cast a glance behind, I saw Abraham Lincoln obeying the divine injunction, by comforting the widowed and the fatherless.

On becoming well established in his profession, Mr. Lincoln took up his permanent residence at Springfield, the county seat of Sangamon county. This occurred in the spring immediately following the passage of the act removing the State capitol to that place, but more than two years before it was to go into effect. The date at which he became settled in Springfield, which has ever since been the place of his residence, was April 15, 1837.

For several years after this removal, Mr. Lincoln remained a bachelor, and was an inmate of the family of the Hon. William Butler, the present Treasurer of the State. For three or four years he continued to represent his county in the Legislature, but after 1840, he refused further public service, with a view to the exclusive pursuit of his profession, the highest success in which he could not hope to obtain while giving so much of his time, as had been hitherto required of him, to political affairs.

On the 4th of November, 1842, Mr. Lincoln was married to Miss MARY TODD, daughter of the Hon. Robert S. Todd, of Lexington, Kentucky. This lady is one of four sisters, the eldest of whom had previously married the Hon. Ninian W. Edwards, and settled at Springfield. All have since married, and reside in the same town. No man was ever more fortunate in his domestic relations than Mr. Lincoln has been; the accomplished manners and social tastes of his wife, which make her a general favorite, being not less conspicuous than her devotion to her family, and her care to render their home cheerful and happy, as well as cordially hospitable to all. They have three children — boys; the eldest of whom is in

his seventeenth year, and the others respectively nine and seven. Another boy, the second child, died when about four years old. The surviving sons have been well trained, and their education very particularly cared for. The oldest has been for some time past fitting for college at Exeter Academy, New Hampshire, and enters Harvard University the present season.

It is proper to add here that Mrs. Lincoln is a Presbyterian by education and profession (two of her sisters are Episcopalians), and that her husband, though not a member, is a liberal supporter of the church to which she belongs. It should further be stated that the Sunday-School, and other benevolent enterprises associated with these church relations, find in him a constant friend.

In this quiet domestic happiness, and in the active practice of his profession, with its round of ordinary duties, and with its exceptional cases of a more general public interest, Mr. Lincoln disappears for the time from political life. Its peculiar excitements, indeed, were not foreign to the stirring and adventurous nature which, as we have seen, was his by inheritance. Nor could the people, and the party of which he was so commanding a leader, long consent to his retirement. Yet such was his prudent purpose — now especially, with a family to care for; and to this he adhered, with only occasional exceptions, until, four years after his marriage, he was elected to Congress.

CHAPTER VII.

CANVASSES OF 1844 AND 1846.

Mr. Lincoln's Devotion to Henry Clay.—The Presidential Nominations of 1844.—The Campaign in Illinois.—Mr. Lincoln Makes an Active Canvass for Clay.—John Calhoun the leading Polk Elector.—The Tariff Issue Thoroughly Discussed.—Method of Conducting the Canvass.—The Whigs of Illinois in a Hopeless Minority.—Mr. Lincoln's Reputation as a Whig Champion.—Renders Efficient Service in Indiana.—Mr. Clay's Defeat and the Consequences.—Mr. Lincoln a Candidate for Congressman in 1846.—President Polk's Administration.—Condition of the Country.—Texas Annexation, the Mexican War and the Tariff.—Political Character of the Springfield District.—Mr. Lincoln Elected by an Unprecedented Majority.—His Personal Popularity Demonstrated.

MR. LINCOLN had, from his first entrance into political life, recognized Henry Clay as his great leader and instructor in statesmanship. His reverence and attachment for the great Kentuckian had been unlimited and enthusiastic. When, therefore, Mr. Clay had been nominated by acclamation for the Presidency by the National Whig Convention, held at Baltimore on the 1st of May, 1844, and when a Democrat of the most offensive school was put in nomination against him, Mr. Lincoln yielded to the demands of the Whigs of Illinois, and, for the first time breaking over the restrictions he had placed upon himself in regard to the exclusive pursuit of his profession, he consented to take a leading position in canvassing the State as an elector. In a State that had stood unshaken in its Democratic position, while so many others had been revolutionized during the great political tempest of 1840, there was, of course, no hope of immediate success. It was deemed an opportunity not to be lost, however, for maintaining and strengthening the Whig organization, and a spirited canvass was consequently made.

On the Democratic side, John Calhoun, then one of the strongest and most popular speakers of that party, and in many respects quite another man than he subsequently became, held the laboring oar for Mr. Polk. Mr. Lincoln traversed various parts of the State, attracting large audiences and keeping their fixed attention for hours, as he held up to admiration the character and doctrines of Henry Clay, and contrasted them with those of his Presidential opponent. On the tariff question, which was the chief issue in Illinois that year, he was particularly elaborate, strongly enforcing the great principles on which the protective system, as maintained by Clay, was based. He had always a fund of anecdote and illustration, with which to relieve his close logical disquisitions, and to elucidate and enforce his views in a manner perfectly intelligible, as well as pleasing to all classes of hearers. This campaign, so barren in immediate results, as it was expected to be in Illinois, was not without its excellent fruits, ultimately, to the party. It had also the effect of establishing Mr. Lincoln's reputation as a political orator, on a still broader and more permanent foundation. From this time forward he was widely known as one of the soundest and most effective of Whig champions in the West.

After doing in Illinois all that could have been required of one man, had this arena been of the most promising description, Mr. Lincoln crossed the Wabash, at the desire of the people of his former State, and contributed largely toward turning the tide of battle for Clay in that really hopeful field. Here he worked most efficiently, losing no opportunity up to the very eve of the election. In Indiana; those efforts have not been forgotten, but will be freshly called to mind, at this juncture, by great numbers of Old Whigs in Southern Indiana.

If any event, more heartily than another, could have discouraged Mr. Lincoln from again participating in political affairs, it was the disastrous result, in the nation at large, of this canvass of 1844. He felt it more keenly than he could have done if it were a mere personal reverse. Mr. Clay was defeated, contrary to the ardent hopes, and even expectations

of his friends, down to the last moment. With the causes and the consequences which followed that event, the impartial historian, at some future day, can more candidly and philosophically speak than any of those who shared in this disappointment. That the election of Mr. Polk over Mr. Clay, made the subsequent political history of our country far different from what it would have been with the opposite result, all will concede.

Two years later, in 1846, Mr. Lincoln was induced to accept the Whig nomination for Congress in the Sangamon District. The annexation of Texas had, in the mean time, been consummated. The Mexican war had been begun, and was still in progress. The Whig tariff of 1842 had just been repealed. This latter event had been accomplished in the Senate by the casting vote of Mr. DALLAS, the Vice President, and with the official approval of Mr. POLK, the President, both of whom had been elected by the aid of Pennsylvania, and had carried the vote of that State solely by being passed off upon the people as favoring the maintenance of the tariff which they thus destroyed.

The Springfield district had given Mr. Clay a majority of 914 in 1844, on the most thorough canvass. It gave Mr. Lincoln a majority of 1,511, which was entirely unprecedented, and has been unequalled by that given there for any opposition candidate, for any office since. The nearest approach was in 1848, when Gen. Taylor, on a much fuller vote than that of 1846, and receiving the votes of numerous returned Mexican volunteers, of Democratic faith, and who had served under him in Mexico, obtained a majority of 1,501. In the same year (1848) Mr. Logan, the popular Whig candidate, was beaten by Col. Thomas L. Harris, Democrat, by 106 majority. There was no good reason to doubt, in advance, that Mr. Lincoln would have been elected by a handsome majority, had he consented to run for another term, nor has it been questionable, since the result became known, that the strong personal popularity of Mr. Lincoln would have saved the district. It was redeemed by Richard Yates in 1850, who carried his election by less than half the majority (754) which Mr. Lincoln had received in 1846. The district, since its reconstruc-

tion, following the census of 1850, has been Democratic. Under all the circumstances, therefore, the vote for Mr. Lincoln was a remarkable one, showing that he possessed a rare degree of strength with the people. His earnest sincerity of manner always strongly impressed those whom he addressed. They knew him to be a man of strong moral convictions. An opponent intended a sneer at this trait (of which he himself was never suspected), when he called Mr. Lincoln "conscientious."

There was a universal confidence in his honest integrity, such as has been rarely extended to men so prominent in political life. The longer he was tried as a public servant, the more his constituents became attached to him. A popularity thus thoroughly grounded is not to be destroyed by the breezes of momentary passion or prejudice, or materially affected by any idle fickleness of the populace.

CHAPTER VIII.

MR. LINCOLN IN CONGRESS.—1847-49.

The Thirtieth Congress—Its Political Character—The Democracy in a Minority in the House.—Robert C. Winthrop Elected Speaker.—Distinguished Members in both Houses.—Mr. Lincoln takes his Seat as a Member of the House, and Mr. Douglas for the first time as a Member of the Senate, at the same Session.—Mr. Lincoln's Congressional Record, that of a Clay and Webster Whig.—The Mexican War.—Mr. Lincoln's Views on the Subject.—Misrepresentations.—Not an Available Issue for Mr. Lincoln's Opponents.—His Resolutions of Inquiry in regard to the Origin of the War.—Mr. Richardson's Resolutions Indorsing the Administration.—Mr. Hudson's Resolutions for an Immediate Discontinuance of the War.—Voted Against by Mr. Lincoln.—Resolutions of Thanks to Gen. Taylor.—Mr. Henley's Amendment, and Mr. Ashmun's Addition thereto.—Resolutions Adopted without Amendment.—Mr. Lincoln's First Speech in Congress, on the Mexican War.—Mr. Lincoln on Internal Improvements.—A Characteristic Campaign Speech—Mr. Lincoln on the Nomination of Gen. Taylor; the Veto Power; National Issues; President and People; the Wilmot Proviso; Platforms; Democratic Sympathy for Clay; Military Heroes and Exploits; Cass a Progressive; Extra Pay; the Whigs and the Mexican War; Democratic Divisions.—Close of the Session.—Mr. Lincoln on the Stump.—Gen. Taylor's Election.—Second Session of the Thirtieth Congress.—Slavery in the District of Columbia.—The Public Lands.—Mr. Lincoln as a Congressman.—He Retires to Private Life.

MR. LINCOLN took his seat in the National House of Representatives on the 6th day of December, 1847, the date of the opening of the Thirtieth Congress. In many respects this Congress was a memorable one. That which preceded, elected at the same time Mr. Polk was chosen to the Presidency, had been strongly Democratic in both branches. The policy of the Administration, however, had been such, during the first two years of its existence, that a great popular reaction had followed.

The present House contained but one hundred and ten Democrats, while the remaining one hundred and eighteen, with the exception of a single Native American from Philadelphia, were nearly all Whigs, the balance being "Free-Soil men," who mostly co-operated with them. Of these, only Messrs. Giddings, Tuck and Palfrey refused to vote for the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop for Speaker, who was elected on the third ballot.

Among the members of the House, on the Whig side, were John Quincy Adams (who died during the first session, and was succeeded by Horace Mann), and George Ashmun of Massachusetts, Washington Hunt of New York, Jacob Collamer and George P. Marsh of Vermont, Truman Smith of Connecticut, Joseph R. Ingersoll and James Pollock of Pennsylvania, John M. Botts and William L. Goggin of Virginia, Alexander H. Stephens, Robert Toombs and Thomas Butler King of Georgia, Henry W. Hilliard of Alabama, Samuel F. Vinton and Robert C. Schenck of Ohio, John B. Thompson and Charles S. Morehead of Kentucky, Caleb B. Smith and Richard W. Thompson of Indiana, and Meredith P. Gentry of Tennessee. On the Democratic side, there were David Wilmot of Pennsylvania, Robert M. McLane of Maryland, James McDowell and Richard K. Meade of Virginia, R. Barnwell Rhett of South Carolina, Howell Cobb of Georgia, Albert G. Brown and Jacob Thompson of Mississippi, Linn Boyd of Kentucky, Andrew Johnson, George W. Jones and Frederick P. Stanton of Tennessee, James S. Greene and John S. Phelps of Missouri, and Kinsley S. Bingham of Michigan. Illinois had seven representatives, of whom Mr. Lincoln was the only Whig. His Democratic colleagues were John A. McClernand, Orlando B. Ficklin, William A. Richardson, Robert Smith, Thomas J. Turner and John Wentworth.

At this session, Stephen A. Douglas took his seat in the Senate, for the first time, having been elected the previous winter. In that body there were but twenty-two Opposition Senators, against thirty-six Democrats. Among the former were Daniel Webster, Wm. L. Dayton, S. S. Phelps, John M. Clayton, Reverdy Johnson, Thomas Corwin, John M. Berrien, and John Bell. On the Democratic side were John C. Cal-

houn, Thomas H. Benton, Daniel S. Dickinson, Simon Cameron, Hannibal Hamlin, Sam Houston, R. M. T. Hunter and William R. King.

Mr. Lincoln was comparatively quite a young man when he entered the House, yet he was early recognized as one of the foremost of the Western men on the floor. His Congressional record, throughout, is that of a Whig of those days, his votes on all leading national subjects, being invariably what those of Clay, Webster or Corwin would have been, had they occupied his place. One of the most prominent subjects of consideration before the Thirtieth Congress, very naturally, was the then existing war with Mexico. Mr. Lincoln was one of those who believed the Administration had not properly managed its affairs with Mexico at the outset, and who, while voting supplies and for suitably rewarding our gallant soldiers in that war, were unwilling to be forced, by any trick of the supporters of the Administration, into an unqualified indorsement of its course in this affair, from beginning to end. In this attitude, Mr. Lincoln did not stand alone. Such was the position of Whig members in both Houses, without exception. Yet his course was unscrupulously misrepresented, during the campaign of 1858, and not improbably will be again during the present canvass. That many men who now support Mr. Lincoln, approved the President's course in regard to the Mexican War, as well in its inception as in its management from first to last, is not improbable. But that all those who, at that time were induced by their party relations, to sustain the Administration, at heart approved the method in which hostilities were precipitated, or felt satisfied that the most commendable motives actuated the Government in its course toward Mexico, is certainly not true. This is not an issue that the present Democratic party need be anxious to resuscitate. Still less will the friends of Mr. Lincoln be reluctant to have his record on this question scrutinized to the fullest extent.

Early in the session, after listening to a long homily on the subject from the President, in his annual message, in which the gauntlet was defiantly thrown down before the Opposition members, and after his colleague, Mr. Richardson, had pro-

posed an unqualified indorsement of the President's views, Mr. Lincoln (December 22, 1847) introduced a series of resolutions of inquiry in regard to the origin of the war. They affirmed nothing, but called for definite official information, such as, if conclusively furnished in detail, and found to accord with the general asseverations of Mr. Polk's messages, would have set him and his administration entirely right before the country. Either such information was accessible, or the repeated statements of the President on this subject were groundless, and his allegations mere pretenses. If the Democratic party was in the right, it had not the least occasion to complain of this procedure, if pressed to a vote. Mr. Lincoln's preamble and resolutions (copied from the *Congressional Globe*, first session, thirtieth Congress, page 64) were in the following words:

WHEREAS, The President of the United States, in his message of May 11, 1846, has declared that "the Mexican Government not only refused to receive him [the envoy of the United States], or listen to his propositions, but, after a long continued series of menaces, has at last invaded *our territory*, and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on *our own soil*:"

And again, in his message of December 8, 1846, that "We had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities; but even then we forbore to take redress into our own hands until Mexico herself became the aggressor, by invading *our soil* in hostile array, and shedding the blood of our citizens:"

And yet again, in his message of December 7, 1847, that "The Mexican Government refused even to hear the terms of adjustment which he [our minister of peace] was authorized to propose, and finally, under wholly unjustifiable pretexts, involved the two countries in war, by invading the territory of the State of Texas, striking the first blow, and shedding the blood of our citizens on *our own soil*:" and,

WHEREAS, This House is desirous to obtain a full knowledge of all the facts which go to establish whether the particular spot on which the blood of our citizens was so shed was or was not at that time "*our own soil*:" therefore,

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to inform this House—

1st. Whether the spot on which the blood of our citizens

was shed, as in his messages declared, was or was not within the territory of Spain, at least after the treaty of 1819, until the Mexican revolution.

2d. Whether that spot is or is not within the territory which was wrested from Spain by the revolutionary Government of Mexico.

3d. Whether that spot is or is not within a settlement of people, which settlement has existed ever since long before the Texas revolution, and until its inhabitants fled before the approach of the United States army.

4th. Whether that settlement is or is not isolated from any and all other settlements by the Gulf and the Rio Grande on the south and west, and by wide uninhabited regions on the north and east.

5th. Whether the people of that settlement, or a majority of them, or any of them, have ever submitted themselves to the government or laws of Texas or of the United States, by consent or by compulsion, either by accepting office, or voting at elections, or paying tax, or serving on juries, or having process served upon them, or in any other way.

6th. Whether the people of that settlement did or did not flee from the approach of the United States army, leaving unprotected their homes and their growing crops, *before* the blood was shed, as in the messages stated; and whether the first blood, so shed, was or was not shed within the inclosure of one of the people who had thus fled from it.

7th. Whether our *citizens*, whose blood was shed, as in his messages declared, were or were not, at that time, armed officers and soldiers, sent into that settlement by the military order of the President, through the Secretary of War.

8th. Whether the military force of the United States was or was not so sent into that settlement after General Taylor had more than once intimated to the War Department that, in his opinion, no such movement was necessary to the defense or protection of Texas.

These resolutions were laid over, under the rule. Many other propositions, embracing the substance of this question were also brought before the House, besides Mr. Richardson's, which ultimately failed. Mr. Lincoln did not call up his resolutions, nor were they ever acted upon; but he commented on them in a speech subsequently made.

On the third day of January, 1848, Mr. Hudson, of Massachusetts, offered a resolution, directing the Committee on Mil-

itary Affairs "to inquire into the expediency of requesting the President of the United States to withdraw to the east bank of the Rio Grande our armies now in Mexico, and to propose to the Mexican Government forthwith a treaty of peace on the following basis, namely: That we relinquish all claim to indemnity for the expenses of the war, and that the boundary between the United States and Mexico shall be established at or near the desert between the Nueces and the Rio Grande; that Mexico shall be held to pay all just claims due to our citizens at the commencement of the war, and that a convention shall be entered into by the two nations to provide for the liquidation of those claims and the mode of payment."

This was a test question on abandoning the war, without any material result accomplished. Mr. Lincoln voted with the minority, in favor of laying this resolution on the table. On the question of adopting the resolution, which was defeated, yet voted for by John Quincy Adams, Ashmun, Vinton, and many others on the Whig side, Mr. Lincoln voted in the negative. (*See Congressional Globe, first session, 30th Congress, page 94.*)

On the same day, almost immediately following the above action, joint resolutions of thanks to General Zachary Taylor and our troops in Mexico, having been offered, an amendment was proposed by Mr. Henley, a Democratic member from Indiana, as an adroit political maneuver, by which it was designed to secure an indorsement of the war from the Whigs, or a refusal of the vote of thanks. He moved the addition of this clause to the resolutions: "engaged, as they were, in defending the rights and honor of the nation." As an amendment to the amendment, in order to defeat its underhand purpose, Mr. Ashmun promptly moved to add the words: "In a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." Mr. Lincoln voted for Ashmun's amendment to Henley's amendment. So also did Messrs. Clingman and Barringer, of North Carolina; A. H. Stephens, Robert Toombs and Thomas Butler King, of Georgia; Goggin, of Virginia; Gentry, of Tennessee; and a majority of

all those voting. [See page 95, as above.] The object intended, of defeating the brilliant movement of Mr. Henley, was accomplished. The amendment, as amended, was not carried. The resolutions, in their original shape, were subsequently reintroduced by Mr. Stephens, and adopted without opposition. (*Congressional Globe*, page 304.)

On the 12th day of January, 1848, Mr. Lincoln expressed his views, frankly and fully, in regard to the war with Mexico. It was the first speech made by Mr. Lincoln in Congress, and is subjoined entire, as reported in the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe* [1st session, 30th Congress, page 93]:

MR. LINCOLN'S SPEECH ON THE MEXICAN WAR.

(*In Committee of the Whole House*, January 12, 1848.)

Mr. Lincoln addressed the Committee as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some, if not all, of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have addressed the Committee within the last two days, have spoken rather complainingly, if I have rightly understood them, of the vote given a week or ten days ago, declaring that the war with Mexico was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President. I admit that such a vote should not be given in mere party wantonness, and that the one given is justly censurable, if it have no other or better foundation. I am one of those who joined in that vote; and did so under my best impression of the *truth* of the case. How I got this impression, and how it may possibly be removed, I will now try to show. When the war began, it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too *little*, or because of knowing too *much*, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President (in the beginning of it), should, nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots, remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended. Some leading Democrats, including ex-President Van Buren, have taken this same view, as I understand them; and I adhered to it, and acted upon it, until since I took my seat here; and I think I should still adhere to it, were it not that the President and his friends will not allow it to be so. Besides, the continual effort of the President to argue every silent vote given for supplies into an indorsement of the justice and wisdom of his conduct; besides that singularly candid paragraph in his late message, in which he tells us that Congress, with great unanimity (only two in the Senate and fourteen in the House dissenting) had declared that "by the

act of the Republic of Mexico a state of war exists between that Government and the United States;" when the same journals that informed him of this, also informed him that, when that declaration stood disconnected from the question of supplies, sixty-seven in the House, and not fourteen, merely, voted against it; besides this open attempt to prove by telling the *truth*, what he could not prove by telling the *whole truth*, demanding of all who will not submit to be misrepresented, in justice to themselves, to speak out; besides all this, one of my colleagues [Mr. Richardson], at a very early day in the session, brought in a set of resolutions, expressly indorsing the original justice of the war on the part of the President. Upon these resolutions, when they shall be put on their passage, I shall be *compelled* to vote; so that I can not be silent if I would. Seeing this, I went about preparing myself to give the vote understandingly, when it should come. I carefully examined the President's messages, to ascertain what he himself had said and proved upon the point. The result of this examination was to make the impression, that, taking for true all the President states as facts, he falls far short of proving his justification; and that the President would have gone further with his proof, if it had not been for the small matter that the *truth* would not permit him. Under the impression thus made I gave the vote before mentioned. I propose now to give, concisely, the process of the examination I made, and how I reached the conclusion I did.

The President, in his first message of May, 1846, declares that the soil was *ours* on which hostilities were commenced by Mexico; and he repeats that declaration, almost in the same language, in each successive annual message—thus showing that he esteems that point a highly essential one. In the importance of that point I entirely agree with the President. To my judgment, it is the *very point* upon which he should be justified or condemned. In his message of December, 1846, it seems to have occurred to him, as is certainly true, that title, ownership to soil, or anything else, is not a simple fact, but is a conclusion following one or more simple facts; and that it was incumbent upon him to present the facts from which he concluded the soil was ours on which the first blood of the war was shed.

Accordingly, a little below the middle of page twelve, in the message last referred to, he enters upon that task; forming an issue and introducing testimony, extending the whole to a little below the middle of page fourteen. Now, I propose to try to show that the whole of this—issue and evidence—is, from beginning to end, the sheerest deception. The issue, as

he presents it, is in these words: "But there are those who, conceding all this to be true, assume the ground that the true western boundary of Texas is the Nueces, instead of the Rio Grande; and that, therefore, in marching our army to the east bank of the latter river, we passed the Texan line, and invaded the territory of Mexico." Now, this issue is made up of two affirmatives and no negative. The main deception of it is, that it assumes as true that *one* river or the *other* is necessarily the boundary, and cheats the superficial thinker entirely out of the idea that *possibly* the boundary is somewhere *between* the two, and not actually at either. A further deception is, that it will let in *evidence* which a true issue would exclude. A true issue made by the President would be about as follows: "I say the soil *was ours* on which the first blood was shed; there are those who say it was not."

I now proceed to examine the President's evidence, as applicable to such an issue. When that evidence is analyzed, it is all included in the following propositions:

1. That the Rio Grande was the western boundary of Louisiana, as we purchased it of France in 1803.

2. That the Republic of Texas always *claimed* the Rio Grande as her western boundary.

3. That, by various acts, she had claimed it *on paper*.

4. That Santa Anna, in his treaty with Texas, recognized the Rio Grande as her boundary.

5. That Texas *before*, and the United States *after* annexation, had *exercised* jurisdiction *beyond* the Nueces, *between* the two rivers.

6. That our Congress *understood* the boundary of Texas to extend beyond the Nueces.

Now for each of these in its turn:

His first item is, that the Rio Grande was the western boundary of Louisiana, as we purchased it of France in 1803; and, seeming to expect this to be disputed, he argues over the amount of nearly a page to prove it true; at the end of which, he lets us know that, by the treaty of 1819, we sold to Spain the whole country, from the Rio Grande eastward to the Sabine. Now, admitting for the present, that the Rio Grande was the boundary of Louisiana, what, under heaven, had that to do with the *present* boundary between us and Mexico? How, Mr. Chairman, the line that once divided your land from mine can *still* be the boundary between us *after* I have sold my land to you, is, to me, beyond all comprehension. And how any man, with an honest purpose only of proving the truth, could ever have *thought* of introducing such a fact to prove such an issue, is equally incomprehensible. The out-

rage upon common *right*, of seizing as our own what we have once sold, merely because it *was* ours *before* we sold it, is only equalled by the outrage on common *sense* of any attempt to justify it.

The President's next piece of evidence is, that "The Republic of Texas always *claimed* this river (Rio Grande) as her western boundary." That is not true, in fact. Texas *has* claimed it, but she has not *always* claimed it. There is, at least, one distinguished exception. Her State Constitution—the public's most solemn and well-considered act; that which may, without impropriety, be called her last will and testament, revoking all others—makes no such claim. But suppose she had always claimed it. Has not Mexico always claimed the contrary? So that there is but *claim* against *claim*, leaving nothing proved until we get back of the claims, and find which has the better *foundation*.

Though not in the order in which the President presents his evidence, I now consider that class of his statements, which are, in substance, nothing more than that Texas has by various acts of her Convention and Congress, claimed the Rio Grande as her boundary—*on paper*. I mean here what he says about the fixing of the Rio Grande as her boundary, in her old Constitution (not her State Constitution), about forming congressional districts, counties, etc. Now, all this is but naked *claim*; and what I have already said about claims is strictly applicable to this. If I should claim your land by word of mouth, that certainly would not make it mine; and if I were to claim it by a deed which I had made myself, and with which you had nothing to do, the claim would be quite the same in substance, or rather in utter nothingness.

I next consider the President's statement that Santa Anna, in his *treaty* with Texas, recognized the Rio Grande as the western boundary of Texas. Besides the position so often taken that Santa Anna, while a prisoner of war—a captive—*could* not bind Mexico by a treaty, which I deem conclusive; besides this, I wish to say something in relation to this treaty, so called by the President, with Santa Anna. If any man would like to be amused by a sight at that *little* thing, which the President calls by that *big* name, he can have it by turning to Niles' Register, volume 50, page 336. And if any one should suppose that Niles' Register is a curious repository of so mighty a document as a solemn treaty between nations, I can only say that I learned, to a tolerable degree of certainty, by inquiry at the State Department, that the President himself never saw it anywhere else. By the way, I believe I **should not err** if I were to declare, that during the first ten

years of the existence of that document, it was never by anybody *called* a treaty; that it was never so called till the President, in his extremity, attempted, by so calling it, to wring something from it in justification of himself in connection with the Mexican war. It has none of the distinguishing features of a treaty. It does not call itself a treaty. Santa Anna does not therein assume to bind Mexico; he assumes only to act as President, Commander-in-chief of the Mexican army and navy; stipulates that the then present hostilities should cease, and that he would not *himself* take up arms, nor *influence* the Mexican people to take up arms, against Texas, during the existence of the war of independence. He did not recognize the independence of Texas; he did not assume to put an end to the war, but clearly indicated his expectation of its continuance; he did not say one word about boundary, and most probably never thought of it. It is stipulated therein that the Mexican forces should evacuate the territory of Texas, *passing to the other side of the Rio Grande*; and in another article it is stipulated, that to prevent collisions between the armies, the Texan army should not approach nearer than within five leagues—of *what* is not said—but clearly, from the object stated, it is of the Rio Grande. Now, if this is a treaty recognizing the Rio Grande as the boundary of Texas, it contains the singular feature of stipulating that Texas shall not go within five leagues of *her own* boundary.

Next comes the evidence of Texas before annexation, and the United States afterward, exercising jurisdiction beyond the Nueces, and *between* the two rivers. This *actual exercise* of jurisdiction is the very class or quality of evidence we want. It is excellent so far as it goes; but does it go far enough? He tells us it went *beyond* the Nueces, but he does not tell us it went *to* the Rio Grande. He tells us jurisdiction was exercised *between* the two rivers, but he does not tell us it was exercised over *all* the territory between them. Some simple-minded people think it possible to cross one river and go beyond it, without going all the way to the next; that jurisdiction may be exercised *between* two rivers without covering *all* the country between them. I know a man, not very unlike myself, who exercises jurisdiction over a piece of land between the Wabash and the Mississippi; and yet so far is this from being *all* there is between those rivers, that it is just one hundred and fifty-two feet long by fifty wide, and no part of it much within a hundred miles of either. He has a neighbor between him and the Mississippi—that is, just across the street, in that direction—whom, I am sure, he could neither *persuade* nor *force* to give up his habitation; but which, never-

theless, he could certainly annex, if it were to be done, by merely standing on his own side of the street and claiming it, or even sitting down and writing a deed for it.

But next, the President tells us, the Congress of the United States *understood* the State of Texas they admitted into the Union to extend *beyond* the Nueces. Well, I suppose they did—I certainly so understand it—but how *far* beyond? That Congress did *not* understand it to extend clear to the Rio Grande, is quite certain by the fact of their joint resolutions for admission expressly leaving all questions of boundary to future adjustment. And, it may be added, that Texas herself is proved to have had the same understanding of it that our Congress had, by the fact of the exact conformity of her new Constitution to those resolutions.

I am now through the whole of the President's evidence; and it is a singular fact, that if any one should declare the President sent the army into the midst of a settlement of Mexican people, who had never submitted, by consent or by force to the authority of Texas or of the United States, and that *there*, and *thereby*, the first blood of the war was shed, there is not one word in all the President has said which would either admit or deny the declaration. In this strange omission chiefly consists the deception of the President's evidence—an omission which, it does seem to me, could scarcely have occurred but by design. My way of living leads me to be about the courts of justice; and there I have some times seen a good lawyer, struggling for his client's neck, in a desperate case, employing every artifice to work round, begot, and cover up with many words some position pressed upon him by the prosecution, which he *dared* not admit, and yet *could* not deny. Party bias may help to make it appear so; but, with all the allowance I can make for such bias, it still does appear to me that just such, and from just such necessity, are the President's struggles in this case.

Some time after my colleague (Mr. Richardson) introduced the resolutions I have mentioned, I introduced a preamble, resolution, and interrogatories, intended to draw the President out, if possible, on this hitherto untrodden ground. To show their relevancy, I propose to state my understanding of the true rule for ascertaining the boundary between Texas and Mexico. It is, that *wherever* Texas was *exercising* jurisdiction was hers; and wherever Mexico was exercising jurisdiction was hers; and that whatever separated the actual exercise of jurisdiction of the one from that of the other, was the true boundary between them. If, as is probably true, Texas was exercising jurisdiction along the western

bank of the Nueces, and Mexico was exercising it along the eastern bank of the Rio Grande, then *neither* river was the boundary, but the uninhabited country between the two was. The extent of our territory in that region depended not on any *treaty-fixed* boundary (for no treaty had attempted it), but on revolution. Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the *right* to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that *can* may revolutionize, and make their *own* of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a *majority* of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a *minority*, intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movements. Such minority was precisely the case of the Tories of our own Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines, or old laws; but to break up both, and make new ones. As to the country now in question, we bought it of France in 1803, and sold it to Spain in 1819, according to the President's statement. After this, all Mexico, including Texas, revolutionized against Spain; and still later, Texas revolutionized against Mexico. In my view, just so far as she carried her revolution, by obtaining the *actual*, willing or unwilling submission of the people, *so far* the country was hers, and no further.

Now, sir, for the purpose of obtaining the very best evidence as to whether Texas had actually carried her revolution to the place where the hostilities of the present war commenced, let the President answer the interrogatories I proposed, as before mentioned, or some other similar ones. Let him answer fully, fairly and candidly. Let him answer with *facts*, and not with arguments. Let him remember he sits where Washington sat; and, so remembering, let him answer as Washington would answer. As a nation *should* not, and the Almighty *will* not, be evaded, so let him attempt no evasion, no equivocation. And if, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed—that it was not within an inhabited country, or, if within such, that the inhabitants had submitted themselves to the civil authority of Texas, or of the United States, and that the same is true of the site of Fort Brown—then I am with him for his justification. In that case, I shall be most happy to reverse the vote I gave the other day. I have a selfish motive for desiring that

the President may do this ; I expect to give some votes, in connection with the war, which, without his so doing, will be of doubtful propriety, in my own judgment, but which will be free from the doubt, if he does so. But if he *can not* or *will not* do this—if, on any pretense, or no pretense, he shall refuse or omit it—then I shall be fully convinced, of what I more than suspect already, that he is deeply conscious of being in the wrong ; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him ; that he ordered General Taylor into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement, purposely to bring on a war ; that originally having some strong motive—what I will not stop now to give my opinion concerning—to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood—that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it, and has swept *on and on*, till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where. How like the half insane mumbling of a fever dream is the whole war part of the late message ! At one time telling us that Mexico has nothing whatever that we can get but territory ; at another, showing us how we can support the war by levying contributions on Mexico. At one time urging the national honor, the security of the future, the prevention of foreign interference, and even the good of Mexico herself, as among the objects of the war ; at another, telling us that, “ to reject indemnity by refusing to accept a cession of territory, would be to abandon all our just demands, and to wage the war, bearing all its expenses, *without a purpose or definite object.*” So, then, the national honor, security of the future, and everything but territorial indemnity, may be considered the *no purposes* and *indefinite* objects of the war ! But having it now settled that territorial indemnity is the only object, we are urged to seize, by legislation here, all that he was content to take a few months ago, and the whole province of Lower California to boot, and to still carry on the war—to take *all* we are fighting for, and *still* fight on. Again, the President is resolved, under all circumstances, to have full territorial indemnity for the expenses of the war ; but he forgets to tell us how we are to get the *excess* after those expenses shall have surpassed the value of the *whole* of the Mexican territory. So, again, he insists that the separate national existence of Mexico shall be maintained ; but he does not tell us *how* this can be done after we shall have taken *all* her territory. Lest

the question I here suggest be considered speculative merely, let me be indulged a moment in trying to show they are not.

The war has gone on some twenty months; for the expenses of which, together with an inconsiderable old score, the President now claims about one-half of the Mexican territory, and that by far the better half, so far as concerns our ability to make any thing out of it. It is comparatively uninhabited; so that we could establish land offices in it, and raise some money in that way. But the other half is already inhabited, as I understand it, tolerably densely for the nature of the country; and all its lands, or all that are valuable, already appropriated as private property. How, then, are we to make any thing out of these lands with this incumbrance on them, or how remove the incumbrance? I suppose no one will say we should kill the people, or drive them out, or make slaves of them, or even confiscate their property? How, then, can we make much out of this part of the territory? If the prosecution of the war has, in expenses, already equaled the *better* half of the country, how long its future prosecution will be in equaling the less valuable half is not a *speculative* but a *practical* question, pressing closely upon us; and yet it is a question which the President seems never to have thought of.

As to the mode of terminating the war and securing peace, the President is equally wandering and indefinite. First, it is to be done by a more vigorous prosecution of the war in the vital parts of the enemy's country; and, after apparently talking himself tired on this point, the President drops down into a half despairing tone, and tells us, that "with a people distracted and divided by contending factions, and a government subject to constant changes, by successive revolutions, *the continued success of our arms may fail to obtain a satisfactory peace.*" Then he suggests the propriety of wheedling the Mexican people to desert the counsels of their own leaders, and, trusting in our protection, to set up a government from which we can secure a satisfactory peace, telling us that "*this may become the only mode of obtaining such a peace.*" But soon he falls into doubt of this too, and then drops back on to the already half-abandoned ground of "more vigorous prosecution." All this shows that the President is in no wise satisfied with his own positions. First, he takes up one, and, in attempting to argue us into it, he argues himself *out* of it; then seizes another, and goes through the same process; and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he has some time before cast off. His mind, tasked beyond its power, is running

hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

Again, it is a singular omission in this message, that it nowhere intimates *when* the President expects the war to terminate. At its beginning, General Scott was, by this same President, driven into disfavor, if not disgrace, for intimating that peace could not be conquered in less than three or four months. But now at the end of about twenty months, during which time our arms have given us the most splendid successes—every department, and every part, land and water, officers and privates, regulars and volunteers, doing all that men could do, and hundreds of things which it had ever before been thought that men could *not* do; after all this, this same President gives us a long message without showing us that, *as to the end*, he has himself even an imaginary conception. As I have before said, he knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably-perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show that there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexity.

Mr. Lincoln was an industrious member of the Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, and thoroughly acquainted himself with the details of that prominent branch of the public service. On the 5th of January, 1848, he made a clear and pertinent speech in regard to a question of temporary interest which then excited considerable attention, the "Great Southern Mail" contract. Some of the Virginia Whig members had taken issue with the Postmaster General, in regard to his action on this question, and there were indications of an attempt to give a partizan turn to the affair. Mr. Lincoln sustained the action of that Democratic official, insisting that his construction of the law in this instance, which was the more economical, was also the more correct one. It is unnecessary to enter into the details of the case here. We subjoin two or three paragraphs from the speech, which was purely a practical one, for the purpose of showing the general spirit and tenor of Mr. Lincoln's mode of dealing with business matters:

"I think that abundant reasons have been given to show that the construction put upon the law by the Postmaster General is the right construction, and that subsequent acts of Congress have confirmed it. I have already said that the

grievance complained of ought to be remedied. But it is said that the sum of money about which all this difficulty has arisen is exceedingly small—not more than \$2,700. I admit it is very small; and if nothing else were involved, it would not be worth the dispute. But there is a principle involved; and if we once yield to a wrong principle, that concession will be the prolific source of endless mischief. It is for this reason, and not for the sake of saving \$2,700, that I am unwilling to yield what is demanded. If I had no apprehensions that the ghost of this yielding would rise and appear in various distant places, I would say, pay the money, and let us have no more fuss about it. But I have such apprehensions. I do believe, that if we yield this, our act will be the source of other claims equally unjust, and therefore I can not vote to make the allowance."

Mr. L. insisted that the true and great point to which the attention of this House or the committee should be directed was, what is a just compensation? Inasmuch as this railroad and steamboat company could afford greater facilities than any other line, the service ought to be done upon this route; but it ought to be done on just and fair principles. If it could not be done at what had been offered, let it be shown that a greater amount was just. But, until it was shown, he was opposed to increasing it. He had seen many things in the report of the Postmaster General and elsewhere that stood out against the river route. Now, the daily steamboat transportation between Troy and New York was performed for less than one hundred dollars per mile. This company was dissatisfied with two hundred and twelve or two hundred and thirteen dollars per mile. It had not been shown, and he thought it could not be shown to them why this company was entitled to more, or so much more, than the other received. It was true, they had to encounter the ice, but was there not more ice further north? There might possibly be shown some reason why the Virginia line should have more; but was there any reason why they should have so much more? Again, the price paid between Cincinnati and Louisville for daily transportation was not two hundred and thirteen dollars per mile, or one hundred dollars, or fifty; it was less than twenty-eight dollars per mile. Now, he did not insist that there might not be some peculiar reasons connected with this route between this city and Richmond that entitled it to more than was paid on the routes between Cincinnati and Louisville, and Troy and New York. But, if there were reasons, they ought to be shown. And was it supposed that there could be any, or so peculiar reasons as to justify so great a difference in compen-

sation as was claimed by this company? It did seem that there could be none.

These reasons actuated him in taking the position he had taken, painfully refusing to oblige his friend from Virginia, which he assured the gentleman he had the greatest inclination to do.

In relation to the report of the committee, let him state one thing: It proposed that the Postmaster General should again offer this company what he had already offered and they had refused. It was for the reason that the Postmaster General, as he understood, had informed them that he was not himself going to renew the proposition. The committee supposed, at any rate he (Mr. L.) supposed—that as soon as the company should know that they could get what he had offered them, and no more—as soon as all hope of greater compensation was cut off—that instant they would not take ten thousand dollars a year for the privilege of doing it. Whether this was actually the case he did not profess positively to know; it was a matter of opinion, but he firmly believed it. In proposing to offer them the contract again, as he had already said, the committee yielded something, viz.: the damage that the Government would have to pay for the breaking up of the present arrangement. He was willing to incur that damage; some other gentlemen were not; they were further away from the position which his friend from Virginia took. He was willing to yield something, but could not consent to go the whole length with the gentleman.

The subject of internal improvements, as before indicated, had long been one in which Mr. Lincoln had taken a special interest. In the Illinois legislature, he had favored the policy of developing the resources of the State by the fostering aid of the local government, in so far as he might, under the constant restraints of a Democratic majority. The great River and Harbor Improvement Convention, held at Chicago, not long before the commencement of his Congressional life—and to which he refers in his subjoined speech on this policy—he had participated in, as one of its most active and earnest members. A brief, fifteen-minute speech of his on that occasion, of which there appears to be no report extant, is still remembered by many of those who heard it, as one of the most eloquent and impressive efforts of that memorable convention, which was presided over by the Hon. Edward Bates,

of St. Louis. Aside from the celebrated speech of the latter, a theme of constant praise from that day to the present, no more electrifying address was made before the convention than that of Mr. Lincoln.

On the 20th day of June, 1848, after the presidential nomination of Mr. Cass, whom "circumstances," it will be remembered, prevented from being present at that convention, Mr. Lincoln took occasion to address the House on this subject. Below is his speech entire, as reported in the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe* for that session (p. 709).

MR. LINCOLN'S SPEECH ON INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

(*In Committee of the Whole House, June 20, 1848.*)

Mr. Lincoln said :

MR. CHAIRMAN : I wish at all times in no way to practice any fraud upon the House or the committee, and I also desire to do nothing which may be very disagreeable to any of the members. I therefore state, in advance, that my object in taking the floor is to make a speech on the general subject of internal improvements ; and if I am out of order in doing so, I give the Chair an opportunity of so deciding, and I will take my seat.

The Chair.—I will not undertake to anticipate what the gentleman may say on the subject of internal improvements. He will, therefore, proceed in his remarks, and if any question of order shall be made, the Chair will then decide it.

Mr. Lincoln.—At an early day of this session the President sent to us what may properly be termed an internal improvement veto message. The late Democratic Convention which sat at Baltimore, and which nominated General Cass for the Presidency, adopted a set of resolutions, now called the Democratic platform, among which is one in these words :

"That the Constitution does not confer upon the General Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements."

General Cass, in his letter accepting the nomination, holds this language :

"I have carefully read the resolutions of the Democratic National Convention, laying down the platform of our political faith, and I adhere to them as firmly as I approve them cordially."

These things, taken together, show that the question of

internal improvements is now more distinctly made—has become more intense, than at any former period. It can no longer be avoided. The veto message and the Baltimore resolution I understand to be, in substance, the same thing; the latter being the more general statement, of which the former is the amplification—the bill of particulars. While I know there are many Democrats, on this floor and elsewhere, who disapprove that message, I understand that all who shall vote for General Cass will thereafter be considered as having approved it, as having indorsed all its doctrines. I suppose all, or nearly all, the Democrats will vote for him. Many of them will do so, not because they like his position on this question, but because they prefer him, being wrong in this, to another, whom they consider further wrong on other questions. In this way the internal improvement Democrats are to be, by a sort of forced consent, carried over, and arrayed against themselves on this measure of policy. General Cass, once elected, will not trouble himself to make a Constitutional argument, or, perhaps, any argument at all, when he shall veto a river or harbor bill. He will consider it a sufficient answer to all Democratic murmurs, to point to Mr. Polk's message, and to the "Democratic platform." This being the case, the question of improvements is verging to a final crisis; and the friends of the policy must now battle, and battle manfully, or surrender all. In this view, humble as I am, I wish to review, and contest as well as I may, the general positions of this veto message. When I say *general* positions, I mean to exclude from consideration so much as relates to the present embarrassed state of the Treasury, in consequence of the Mexican war.

Those general positions are: That internal improvements ought not to be made by the General Government:

1. Because they would overwhelm the treasury;
2. Because, while their *burdens* would be general, their *benefits* would be *local* and *partial*, involving an obnoxious inequality;
3. Because they would be unconstitutional;
4. Because the States may do enough by the levy and collection of tonnage duties; or, if not,
5. That the Constitution may be amended.

"Do nothing at all, lest you do something wrong," is the sum of these positions—is the sum of this message; and this, with the exception of what is said about Constitutionality, applying as forcibly to making improvements by State authority as by the national authority. So that we must abandon the improvements of the country altogether, by any and every

authority, or we must resist and repudiate the doctrines of this message. Let us attempt the latter.

The first position is, that a system of internal improvement would overwhelm the treasury.

That, in such a system, there is a *tendency* to undue expansion, is not to be denied. Such tendency is founded in the nature of the subject. A member of Congress will prefer voting for a bill which contains an appropriation for his district, to voting for one which does not; and when a bill shall be expanded till every district shall be provided for, that it will be too greatly expanded is obvious. But is this any more true in Congress than in a State Legislature? If a member of Congress must have an appropriation for his district, so a member of a Legislature must have one for his county; and if one will overwhelm the national treasury, so the other will overwhelm the State treasury. Go where we will, the difficulty is the same. Allow it to drive us from the halls of Congress, and it will just as easily drive us from the State Legislatures. Let us, then, grapple with it, and test its strength. Let us, judging of the future by the past, ascertain whether there may not be, in the discretion of Congress, a sufficient power to limit and restrain this expansive tendency within reasonable and proper bounds. The President himself values the evidence of the past. He tells us that at a certain point of our history, more than two hundred millions of dollars had been *applied for*, to make improvements, and this he does to prove that the treasury would be overwhelmed by such a system. Why did he not tell us how much was *granted*? Would not that have been better evidence? Let us turn to it, and see what it proves. In the message, the President tells us that "during the four succeeding years, embraced by the administration of President Adams, the power not only to appropriate money, but to apply it, under the direction and authority of the General Government, as well to the construction of roads as to the improvement of harbors and rivers, was fully asserted and exercised."

This, then, was the period of greatest enormity. These, if any, must have been the days of the two hundred millions. And how much do you suppose was really expended for improvements during those four years? Two hundred millions? One hundred? Fifty? Ten? Five? No, sir, less than two millions. As shown by authentic documents, the expenditures on improvements during 1825, 1826, 1827 and 1828, amounted to \$1,879,627 01. These four years were the period of Mr. Adams' administration, nearly, and substantially. This fact shows that when the power to make improvements was "fully asserted and exercised," the Congresses *did* keep within rea-

sonable limits; and what *has* been done it seems to me, *can* be done again.

Now for the second position of the message, namely, that the burdens of improvements would be *general*, while their *benefits* would be *local* and *partial*, involving an obnoxious inequality. That there is some degree of truth in this position I shall not deny. No commercial object of Government patronage can be so exclusively *general*, as not to be of some peculiar *local* advantage; but, on the other hand, nothing is so *local* as not to be of some general advantage. The navy, as I understand it, was established, and is maintained, at a great annual expense, partly to be ready for war, when war shall come, but partly also, and perhaps chiefly, for the protection of our commerce on the high seas. This latter object is, for all I can see, in principle, the same as internal improvements. The driving a pirate from the track of commerce on the broad ocean, and the removing a snag from its more narrow path in the Mississippi river, can not, I think, be distinguished in principle. Each is done to save life and property, and for nothing else. The navy, then, is the most general in its benefits of all this class of objects; and yet even the navy is of some peculiar advantage to Charleston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, beyond what it is to the interior towns of Illinois. The next most general object I can think of, would be improvements on the Mississippi river and its tributaries. They touch thirteen of our States—Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Iowa. Now, I suppose it will not be denied, that these thirteen States are a little more interested in improvements on that great river than are the remaining seventeen. These instances of the navy, and the Mississippi river, show clearly that there is something of local advantage in the most general objects. But the converse is also true. Nothing is so *local* as not to be of some *general* benefit. Take, for instance, the Illinois and Michigan canal. Considered apart from its effects, it is perfectly local. Every inch of it is within the State of Illinois. That canal was first opened for business last April. In a very few days we were all gratified to learn, among other things, that sugar had been carried from New Orleans, through the canal, to Buffalo, in New York. This sugar took this route, doubtless, because it was cheaper than the old route. Supposing the benefit in the reduction of the cost of carriage to be shared between seller and buyer, the result is, that the New Orleans merchant sold his sugar a little *dearer*, and the people of Buffalo sweetened their coffee a little

cheaper than before; a benefit resulting *from* the canal, not to Illinois, where the canal *is*, but to Louisiana and New York, where it is *not*. In other transactions Illinois will, of course, have her share, and perhaps the larger share too, in the benefits of the canal; but the instance of the sugar clearly shows that the *benefits* of an improvement are by no means confined to the particular locality of the improvement itself.

The just conclusion from all this is, that if the nation refuse to make improvements of the more general kind, because their benefits may be somewhat local, a State may, for the same reason, refuse to make an improvement of a local kind, because its benefits may be somewhat general. A State may well say to the nation: "If you will do nothing for me, I will do nothing for you." Thus it is seen, that if this argument of "inequality" is sufficient anywhere, it is sufficient everywhere, and puts an end to improvements altogether. I hope and believe, that if both the nation and the States would, in good faith, in their respective spheres, do what they could in the way of improvements, what of inequality might be produced in one place might be compensated in another, and that the sum of the whole might not be very unequal. But suppose, after all, there should be some degree of inequality: inequality is certainly never to be embraced for its own sake; but is every good thing to be discarded which may be inseparably connected with some degree of it? If so, we must discard all government. This Capitol is built at the public expense, for the public benefit; but does any one doubt that it is of some peculiar local advantage to the property holders and business people of Washington? Shall we remove it for this reason? And if so, where shall we set it down, and be free from the difficulty? To make sure of our object, shall we locate it nowhere, and leave Congress hereafter to hold its sessions as the loafer lodged, "in spots about?" I make no special allusion to the present President when I say, there are few stronger cases in this world of "burden to the many, and benefit to the few" — of "inequality" — than the Presidency itself is by some thought to be. An honest laborer digs coal at about seventy cents a day, while the President digs abstractions at about seventy dollars a day. The *coal* is clearly worth more than the *abstractions*, and yet what a monstrous inequality in the prices! Does the President, for this reason, propose to abolish the Presidency? He *does* not, and he *ought* not. The true rule, in determining to embrace or reject anything, is not whether it have *any* evil in it, but whether it have more of evil than of good. There are few things *wholly* evil or *wholly* good.

Almost every thing, especially of government policy, is an inseparable compound of the two; so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continually demanded. On this principle, the President, his friends, and the world generally, act on most subjects. Why not apply it, then, upon this question? Why, as to improvements, magnify the *evil*, and stoutly refuse to see any good in them?

Mr. Chairman, on the third position of the message (the Constitutional question) I have not much to say. Being the man I am, and speaking when I do, I feel that in any attempt at an original, Constitutional argument, I should not be, and ought not to be, listened to patiently. The ablest and the best of men have gone over the whole ground long ago. I shall attempt but little more than a brief notice of what some of them have said. In relation to Mr. Jefferson's views, I read from Mr. Polk's veto message:

"President Jefferson, in his message to Congress in 1806, recommended an amendment of the Constitution, with a view to apply an anticipated surplus in the treasury 'to the great purposes of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvements as it may be thought proper to add to the Constitutional enumeration of the Federal powers.' And he adds: 'I suppose an amendment to the Constitution, by consent of the States, necessary, because the objects now recommended are not among those enumerated in the Constitution, and to which it permits the public moneys to be applied.' In 1825, he repeated, in his published letters, the opinion that no such power has been conferred upon Congress."

I introduce this, not to controvert, just now, the Constitutional opinion, but to show, that on the question of *expediency*, Mr. Jefferson's opinion was against the present President—that this opinion of Mr. Jefferson, in one branch at least, is, in the hands of Mr. Polk, like McFingal's gun:

"Bears wide and kicks the owner over."

But, to the Constitutional question. In 1826, Chancellor Kent first published his Commentaries on American Law. He devoted a portion of one of the lectures to the question of the authority of Congress to appropriate public moneys for internal improvements. He mentions that the question had never been brought under judicial consideration, and proceeds to give a brief summary of the discussions it had undergone between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. He shows that the legislative branch had usually *been for*, and the executive *against*, the power, till the period

of Mr. J. Q. Adams' administration; at which point he considers the executive influence as withdrawn from opposition, and added to the support of the power. In 1844, the Chancellor published a new edition of his Commentaries, in which he adds some notes of what had transpired on the question since 1826. I have not time to read the original text, or the notes, but the whole may be found on page 267, and the two or three following pages of the first volume of the edition of 1844. As what Chancellor Kent seems to consider the sum of the whole, I read from one of the notes:

"Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, vol. 2, page 429-440, and again, page 519-538, has stated at large the arguments for and against the proposition that Congress have a Constitutional authority to lay taxes, and to apply the power to regulate commerce, as a means directly to encourage and protect domestic manufactures; and, without giving any opinion of his own on the contested doctrine, he has left the reader to draw his own conclusion. I should think, however, from the arguments as stated, that every mind which has taken no part in the discussions, and felt no prejudice or territorial bias on either side of the question, would deem the arguments in favor of the Congressional power vastly superior."

It will be seen, that in this extract, the power to make improvements is not directly mentioned; but by examining the context, both of Kent and of Story, it will appear that the power mentioned in the extract and the power to make improvements, are regarded as identical. It is not to be denied that many great and good men have been *against* the power; but it is insisted that quite as many, as great, and as good, have been *for* it; and it is shown that, on a full survey of the whole, Chancellor Kent was of opinion that the arguments of the latter were *vastly* superior. This is but the opinion of a man; but who was that man? He was one of the ablest and most learned lawyers of his age, or of any other age. It is no disparagement to Mr. Polk, nor, indeed, to any one who devotes much time to politics, to be placed far behind Chancellor Kent as a lawyer. His attitude was most favorable to correct conclusions. He wrote coolly and in retirement. He was struggling to rear a durable monument of fame; and he well knew that *truth* and thoroughly sound reasoning were the only sure foundations. Can the party opinion of a party President, on a law question, as this purely is, be at all compared or set in opposition to that of such a man, in such an attitude, as Chancellor Kent?

This Constitutional question will probably never be better

settled than it is, until it shall pass under judicial consideration; but I do think that no man who is clear on this question of expediency need feel his conscience much pricked upon this.

Mr. Chairman, the President seems to think that enough may be done in the way of improvements, by means of tunnage duties, under State authority, with the consent of the General Government. Now, I suppose this matter of tunnage duties is well enough in its own sphere. I suppose it may be efficient, and perhaps *sufficient*, to make slight improvements and repairs in harbors already in use, and not much out of repair. But if I have any correct general idea of it, it must be wholly inefficient for any generally beneficent purposes of improvement. I know very little, or rather nothing at all, of the practical matter of levying and collecting tunnage duties; but I suppose one of its principles must be, to lay a duty, for the improvement of any particular harbor, *upon the tunnage coming into that harbor*. To do otherwise—to collect money in *one* harbor to be expended on improvements in *another*—would be an extremely aggravated form of that inequality which the President so much deprecates. If I be right in this, how could we make any entirely new improvements by means of tunnage duties? How make a road, a canal, or clear a greatly obstructed river? The idea that we could, involves the same absurdity of the Irish bull about the new boots: “I shall niver git ’em on,” says Patrick. “till I wear ’em a day or two, and stretch ’em a little.” We shall never make a canal by tunnage duties, until it shall already have been made awhile, so the tunnage can get into it.

After all, the President concludes that possibly there may be some great objects of improvements which can not be effected by tunnage duties, and which, therefore, may be expedient for the General Government to take in hand. Accordingly, he suggests, in case any such be discovered, the propriety of amending the Constitution. Amend it for what? If, like Mr. Jefferson, the President thought improvements *expedient*, but not Constitutional, it would be natural enough for him to recommend such an amendment; but hear what he says in this very message:

“In view of these portentous consequences, I can not but think that this course of legislation should be arrested, even were there nothing to forbid it in the fundamental laws of our Union.”

For what, then, would *he* have the Constitution amended? With *him* it is a proposition to remove *one* impediment, merely to be met by *others*, which, in his opinion, can not be

removed—to enable Congress to do what, in his opinion, they ought not to do if they could.

[Here Mr. Meade, of Virginia, inquired if Mr. L. understood the President to be opposed, on grounds of expediency, to any and every improvement?]

To which Mr. Lincoln answered: In the very part of his message of which I am now speaking, I understand him as giving some vague expressions in favor of some possible objects of improvements; but, in doing so, I understand him to be directly in the teeth of his own arguments in other parts of it. Neither the President, nor any one, can possibly specify an improvement, which shall not be clearly liable to one or another of the objections he has urged on the score of expediency. I have shown, and might show again, that no work—no object—can be so general, as to dispense its benefits with precise equality; and this inequality is chief among the “portentous consequences” for which he declares that improvements should be arrested. No, sir; when the President intimates that something in the way of improvements may properly be done by the General Government, he is shrinking from the conclusions to which his own arguments would force him. He feels that the improvements of this broad and goodly land are a mighty interest; and he is unwilling to confess to the people, or perhaps to himself, that he has built an argument which, when pressed to its conclusion, entirely annihilates this interest.

I have already said that no one who is satisfied of the expediency of making improvements need be much uneasy in his conscience about its Constitutionality. I wish now to submit a few remarks on the general proposition of amending the Constitution. As a general rule, I think we would do much better to let it alone. No slight occasion should tempt us to touch it. Better not take the first step, which may lead to a habit of altering it. Better rather habituate ourselves to think of it as unalterable. It can scarcely be made better than it is. New provisions would introduce new difficulties, and thus create and increase appetite for further change. No, sir; let it stand as it is. New hands have never touched it. The men who made it have done their work, and have passed away. Who shall improve on what *they* did?

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of reviewing this message in the least possible time, as well as for the sake of distinctness, I have analyzed its arguments as well as I could, and reduced them to the propositions I have stated. I have now examined them in detail. I wish to detain the committee only a little while longer, with some general remarks on the subject of

improvements. That the subject is a difficult one, can not be denied. Still, it is no more difficult in Congress than in the State legislatures, in the counties, or in the smallest municipal districts which everywhere exist. All can recur to instances of this difficulty in the case of county roads, bridges, and the like. One man is offended because a road passes over his land; and another is offended because it does *not* pass over his; one is dissatisfied because the bridge, for which he is taxed, crosses the river on a different road from that which leads from his house to town; another can not bear that the county should get in debt for these same roads and bridges; while not a few struggle hard to have roads located over their lands, and then stoutly refuse to let them be opened, until they are first paid the damages. Even between the different wards and streets of towns and cities, we find this same wrangling and difficulty. Now, these are no other than the very difficulties against which, and out of which, the President constructs his objections of "inequality," "speculation," and "crushing the Treasury." There is but a single alternative about them—they are *sufficient*, or they are *not*. If sufficient, they are sufficient *out* of Congress as well as *in* it, and there is the end. We must reject them as insufficient, or lie down and do nothing by any authority. Then, difficulty though there be, let us meet and overcome it.

"Attempt the end, and never stand to doubt;
Nothing so hard, but search will find it out."

Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way. The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty. How to do *something*, and still not to do *too much*, is the desideratum. Let each contribute his mite in the way of suggestion. The late Silas Wright, in a letter to the Chicago convention, contributed his, which was worth something; and I now contribute mine, which may be worth nothing. At all events, it will mislead nobody, and therefore will do no harm. I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose that at each session, Congress shall first determine *how much* money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most *important* objects. So far all is easy; but how shall we determine which *are* the most important? On this question comes the collision of interests. I shall be slow to acknowledge that *your* harbor or *your* river is more important than *mine*, and *vice versa*. To clear this difficulty, let us have that same statistical information which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vinton] suggested

at the beginning of this session. In that information we shall have a stern, unbending basis of *facts*—a basis in nowise subject to whim, caprice, or local interest. The pre-limited amount of means will save us from doing *too much*, and the statistics will save us from doing what we do, in *wrong places*. Adopt and adhere to this course, and, it seems to me, the difficulty is cleared.

One of the gentlemen from South Carolina (Mr. Rhett) very much deprecates these statistics. He particularly objects, as I understand him, to counting all the pigs and chickens in the land. I do not perceive much force in the objection. It is true, that if everything be enumerated, a portion of such statistics may not be very useful to this object. Such products of the country as are to be *consumed* where they are *produced*, need no roads and rivers, no means of transportation, and have no very proper connection with this subject. The *surplus*, that which is produced in *one* place to be consumed in *another*; the capacity of each locality for producing a *greater* surplus; the natural means of transportation, and their susceptibility of improvement; the hindrances, delays, and losses of life and property during transportation, and the causes of each, would be among the most valuable statistics in this connection. From these it would readily appear where a given amount of expenditure would do the most good. These statistics might be equally accessible, as they would be equally useful, to both the nation and the States. In this way, and by these means, let the nation take hold of the larger works, and the States the smaller ones; and thus, working in a meeting direction, discreetly, but steadily and firmly, what is made unequal in one place may be equalized in another, extravagance avoided, and the whole country put on that career of prosperity, which shall correspond with its extent of territory, its natural resources, and the intelligence and enterprise of its people.

The first session of the Thirtieth Congress was prolonged far beyond the date of the Presidential nominations of 1848, and the canvass was actively carried on by members on the floor of the House. Mr. Lincoln warmly sustained the nomination of Gen. Taylor, and before the adjournment of Congress, he made, in accordance with precedent and general practice, one of his characteristic campaign speeches. He showed himself a man of decided partizan feelings, and entered into this contest with zeal, not only repelling the violent attacks upon the Whig candidate, but showing that there were blows

to be given as well as taken. He said some things in a vein of sarcastic humor, which could only have been mistaken for actual bitterness, by those who did not know the really genial character of the man. Argument, ridicule and illustrative anecdotes were brought into requisition, with great ability and unsparing boldness, in setting the real issues of the canvass, political and personal, in what he deemed a proper light before the people.

Although containing so many things of mere temporary interest, this speech will be read with avidity at the present time, and particularly on account of several passages which have especial significance from the position Mr. Lincoln himself now occupies—what had then probably never once seriously entered his thoughts as among the events of the future. This effort will perhaps give occasional offense to the purist in style, but its manly earnestness and force, and its adaptedness to popular effect as a campaign document, will not be called in question. It is obvious that some change has taken place in Mr. Lincoln's manner of speaking since those days, yet his first appearance in the national arena of politics exhibited that rugged strength and that earnest directness of expression which have given him permanent power with popular auditories.

MR. LINCOLN'S SPEECH ON THE PRESIDENCY AND GENERAL POLITICS.

(Delivered in the House, July 27, 1848.)

GEN. TAYLOR AND THE VETO POWER.

Mr. Lincoln said—

MR. SPEAKER :—Our Democratic friends seem to be in great distress because they think our candidate for the Presidency don't suit *us*. Most of them can not find out that Gen. Taylor has any principles at all ; some, however, have discovered that he has *one*, but that that one is entirely wrong. This one principle is his position on the veto power. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Stanton) who has just taken his seat, indeed, has said there is very little if any difference on this question between Gen. Taylor and all the Presidents ; and he seems to think it sufficient detraction from Gen. Taylor's position on it, that it has nothing new in it. But all others, whom I have heard speak, assail it furiously. A new member from Ken-

tucky (Mr. Clarke*) of very considerable ability, was in particular concern about it. He thought it altogether novel and unprecedented for a President, or a Presidential candidate, to think of approving bills whose Constitutionality may not be entirely clear to his own mind. He thinks the ark of our safety is gone, unless Presidents shall always veto such bills as, in their judgment, may be of *doubtful* Constitutionality. However clear Congress may be of their authority to pass any particular act, the gentleman from Kentucky thinks the President must veto it if *he* has *doubts* about it. Now I have neither time nor inclination to argue with the gentleman on the veto power as an original question; but I wish to show that Gen. Taylor, and not he, agrees with the earliest statesmen on this question. When the bill chartering the first Bank of the United States passed Congress, its Constitutionality was questioned; Mr. Madison, then in the House of Representatives, as well as others, had opposed it on that ground. Gen. Washington, as President, was called on to approve or reject it. He sought and obtained, on the Constitutional question, the separate written opinions of Jefferson, Hamilton and Edmund Randolph, they then being respectively Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, and Attorney General. Hamilton's opinion was for the power; while Randolph's and Jefferson's were both against it. Mr. Jefferson, after giving his opinion decidedly against the Constitutionality of that bill, closed his letter with the paragraph which I now read:

"It must be admitted, however, that unless the President's mind, on a view of everything which is urged for and against this bill, is tolerably clear that it is unauthorized by the Constitution; if the pro and the con hang so even as to balance his judgment, a just respect for the wisdom of the Legislature would naturally decide the balance in favor of their opinion; it is chiefly for cases where they are clearly misled by error, ambition or interest, that the Constitution has placed a check in the negative of the President. THOMAS JEFFERSON.

"*February 15, 1791.*"

Gen. Taylor's opinion, as expressed in his Allison letter, is as I now read:

"The power given by the veto is a high conservative power; but, in my opinion, should never be exercised, except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress."

It is here seen that, in Mr. Jefferson's opinion, if, on the Constitutionality of any given bill, the President *doubts*, he is

*The late Hon. Beverly L. Clarke.

not to veto it, as the gentleman from Kentucky would have him to do, but is to defer to Congress and approve it. And if we compare the opinions of Jefferson and Taylor, as expressed in these paragraphs, we shall find them more exactly alike than we can often find any two expressions having any literal difference. None but interested fault-finders, can discover any substantial variation.

THE NATIONAL ISSUES.

But gentlemen on the other side are unanimously agreed that Gen. Taylor has no other principle. They are in utter darkness as to his opinions on any of the questions of policy which occupy the public attention. But is there any doubt as to what he will *do* on the prominent questions, if elected? Not the least. It is not possible to know what he will or would do in every imaginable case; because many questions have passed away, and others doubtless will arise which none of us have yet thought of; but on the prominent questions of currency, tariff, internal improvements, and Wilmot proviso, General Taylor's course is at least as well defined as is General Cass's. Why, in their eagerness to get at General Taylor, several Democratic members here have desired to know whether, in case of his election, a bankrupt law is to be established. Can they tell us General Cass's opinion on this question? (Some member answered, "He is against it.") Aye, how do you know he is? There is nothing about it in the platform, nor elsewhere, that I have seen. If the gentleman knows anything which I do not, he can show it. But to return: General Taylor, in his Allison letter, says:

"Upon the subject of the tariff, the currency, the improvement of our great highways, rivers, lakes, and harbors, the will of the people, as expressed through their Representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive."

A PRESIDENCY FOR THE PEOPLE.

Now, this is the whole matter—in substance, it is this: The people say to General Taylor, "If you are elected, shall we have a national bank?" He answers, "*Your* will, gentlemen, not *mine*." "What about the tariff?" "Say yourselves." "Shall our rivers and harbors be improved?" "Just as you please." "If you desire a bank, an alteration of the tariff, internal improvements, any or all, I will not hinder you; if you do not desire them, I will not attempt to force them on you." "Send up your members of Congress from the various districts, with opinions according to your own, and if they are for these measures, or any of them, I shall have nothing to

oppose; if they are not for them, I shall not, by any appliances whatever, attempt to dragoon them into their adoption." Now, can there be any difficulty in understanding this? To you, Democrats, it may not seem like principle; but surely you can not fail to perceive the position plainly enough. The distinction between it and the position of your candidate is broad and obvious, and I admit you have a clear right to show it is wrong, if you can; but you have no right to pretend you can not see it at all. We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business. My friend from Indiana (Mr. C. B. Smith) has aptly asked, "Are you willing to trust the people?" Some of you answered, substantially, "We are willing to trust the people; but the President is as much the representative of the people as Congress." In a certain sense, and to a certain extent, he is the representative of the people. He is elected by them, as well as Congress is. But can he, in the nature of things, know the wants of the people as well as three hundred other men coming from all the various localities of the nation? If so, where is the propriety of having a Congress? That the Constitution gives the President a negative on legislation, all know; but that this negative should be so combined with platforms and other appliances as to enable him, and, in fact, almost compel him, to take the whole of legislation into his own hands, is what we object to—is what General Taylor objects to—and is what constitutes the broad distinction between you and us. To thus transfer legislation is clearly to take it from those who understand with minuteness the interest of the people, and give it to one who does not and can not so well understand it. I understand your idea, that if a Presidential candidate avow his opinion upon a given question, or rather upon all questions, and the people, with full knowledge of this, elect him, they thereby distinctly approve all those opinions. This, though plausible, is a most pernicious deception. By means of it measures are adopted or rejected, contrary to the wishes of the whole of one party, and often nearly half of the other. The process is this: Three, four, or half a dozen questions are prominent at a given time; the party selects its candidate, and he takes his position on each of these questions. On all but one his positions have already been indorsed at former elections, and his party fully committed to them; but that one is new, and a large portion of them are against it. But what are they to do? The whole are strung together, and they must take all or reject all. They can not take what they like and leave the rest. What they

are already committed to, being the majority, they shut their eyes and gulp the whole. Next election, still another is introduced in the same way. If we run our eyes along the line of the past, we shall see that almost, if not quite, all the articles of the present Democratic creed have been at first forced upon the party in this very way. And just now, and just so, opposition to internal improvements is to be established if Gen. Cass shall be elected. Almost half the Democrats here are for improvements, but they will vote for Cass, and if he succeeds, their votes will have aided in closing the doors against improvements. Now, this is a process which we think is wrong. We prefer a candidate who, like Gen. Taylor, will allow the people to have their own way regardless of his private opinion; and I should think the internal-improvement Democrats at least, ought to prefer such a candidate. He would force nothing on them which they don't want, and he would allow them to have improvements, which their own candidate, if elected, will not.

GEN. TAYLOR AND THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

Mr. Speaker, I have said Gen. Taylor's position is as well defined as is that of Gen. Cass. In saying this, I admit I do not certainly know what he would do on the Wilmot proviso. I am a Northern man, or, rather, a Western free State man, with a constituency I believe to be, and with personal feelings I know to be, against the extension of slavery. As such, and with what information I have, I hope, and *believe*, Gen. Taylor, if elected, would not veto the proviso; but I do not *know* it. Yet, if I knew he would, I still would vote for him. I should do so, because, in my judgment, his election alone can defeat Gen. Cass; and because, *should* slavery thereby go into the territory we now have, just so much will certainly happen by the election of Cass; and, in addition, a course of policy leading to new wars, new acquisitions of territory, and still further extensions of slavery. One of the two is to be President; which is preferable?

CASS ON INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

But there is as much doubt of Cass on improvements as there is of Taylor on the proviso. I have no doubt myself of Gen. Cass on this question, but I know the Democrats differ among themselves as to his position. My internal improvement colleague (Mr. Wentworth) stated on this floor the other day, that he was satisfied Cass was for improvements, because he had voted for all the bills that he (Mr. W.) had. So far so good. But Mr. Polk vetoed some of

these very bills; the Baltimore Convention passed a set of resolutions, among other things, approving these vetoes, and Cass declares, in his letter accepting the nomination, that he has carefully read these resolutions, and that he adheres to them as firmly as he approves them cordially. In other words, Gen. Cass voted for the bills, and thinks the President did right to veto them; and his friends here are amiable enough to consider him as being on one side or the other, just as one or the other may correspond with their own respective inclinations. My colleague admits that the platform declares against the Constitutionality of a general system of improvements, and that Gen. Cass indorses the platform; but he still thinks Gen. Cass is in favor of some sort of improvements. Well, what are they? As he is against *general* objects, those he is *for*, must be *particular* and *local*. Now, this is taking the subject precisely by the wrong end. *Particularity*—expending the money of the *whole* people for an object which will benefit only a *portion* of them, is the greatest real objection to improvements, and has been so held by Gen. Jackson, Mr. Polk, and all others, I believe, till now. But now, behold, the objects most general, nearest free from this objection, are to be rejected, while those most liable to it are to be embraced. To return: I can not help believing that Gen. Cass, when he wrote his letter of acceptance, well understood he was to be claimed by the advocates of both sides of this question, and that he then closed the door against all further expressions of opinion, purposely to retain the benefits of that double position. His subsequent equivocation at Cleveland, to my mind, proves such to have been the case.

PLATFORMS.

One word more, and I shall have done with this branch of the subject. You Democrats, and your candidate, in the main are in favor of laying down, in advance, a platform—a set of party positions, as a unit; and then of enforcing the people, by every sort of appliance, to ratify them, however unpalatable some of them may be. We, and our candidate, are in favor of making Presidential elections and the legislation of the country distinct matters; so that the people can elect whom they please, and afterward legislate just *as they please*, without any hindrance, save only so much as may guard against infractions of the Constitution, undue haste, and want of consideration. The difference between us is clear as noon-day. That we are right we can not doubt. We hold the true Republican position. In leaving the people's business in

their hands, we can not be wrong. We are willing, and even anxious, to go to the people on this issue.

MR. CLAY'S DEFEAT AND DEMOCRATIC SYMPATHIES.

But I suppose I can not reasonably hope to convince you that we have any principles. The most I can expect is, to assure you that we think we have, and are quite contented with them. The other day, one of the gentlemen from Georgia (Mr. Iverson), an eloquent man, and a man of learning, so far as I can judge, not being learned myself, came down upon us astonishingly. He spoke in what the *Baltimore American* calls the "scathing and withering style." At the end of his second severe flash I was struck blind, and found myself feeling with my fingers for an assurance of my continued physical existence. A little of the bone was left, and I gradually revived. He eulogized Mr. Clay in high and beautiful terms, and then declared that we had deserted all our principles, and had turned Henry Clay out, like an old horse, to root. This is terribly severe. It can not be answered by argument; at least, I can not so answer it. I merely wish to ask the gentleman if the Whigs are the only party he can think of, who sometimes turn old horses out to root? Is not a certain Martin Van Buren an old horse, which your own party have turned out to root? and is he not rooting a little to your discomfort about now? But in not nominating Mr. Clay, we deserted our principles, you say. Ah! in what? Tell us, ye men of principles, what principle we violated? We say you did violate principle in discarding Van Buren, and we can tell you how. You violated the primary, the cardinal, the one great living principle of all Democratic representative government—the principle that the representative is bound to carry out the known will of his constituents. A large majority of the Baltimore Convention of 1844 were, by their constituents, instructed to procure Van Buren's nomination if they could. In violation, in utter, glaring contempt of this, you rejected him—rejected him, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. Birdsall), the other day expressly admitted, for *availability*—that same "general availability" which you charge upon us, and daily chew over here, as something exceedingly odious and unprincipled. But the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Iverson), gave us a second speech yesterday, all well considered and put down in writing, in which Van Buren was scathed and withered a "few" for his present position and movements. I can not remember the gentleman's precise language, but I do

remember he put Van Buren down, down, till he got him where he was finally to "stink" and "rot."

Mr. Speaker, it is no business or inclination of mine to defend Martin Van Buren. In the war of extermination now waging between him and his old admirers, I say, devil take the hindmost—and the foremost. But there is no mistaking the origin of the breach; and if the curse of "stinking" and "rotting" is to fall on the first and greatest violaters of principle in the matter, I disinterestedly suggest, that the gentleman from Georgia and his present co-workers are bound to take it upon themselves.

[Mr. Lincoln then proceeded to speak of the objections against Gen. Taylor as a mere military hero; retorting with effect, by citing the attempt to make out a military record for Gen. Cass; and referring, in a bantering way, to his own services in the Black Hawk war, as already quoted. He then said:—]

CASS ON THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

While I have Gen. Cass in hand, I wish to say a word about his political principles. As a specimen, I take the record of his progress on the Wilmot Proviso. In the Washington Union, of March 2, 1847, there is a report of the speech of Gen. Cass, made the day before in the Senate, on the Wilmot Proviso, during the delivery of which Mr. Miller, of New Jersey, is reported to have interrupted him as follows, to-wit:

"Mr. Miller expressed his great surprise at the change in the sentiments of the Senator from Michigan, who had been regarded as the great champion of freedom in the North-west of which he was a distinguished ornament. Last year the Senator from Michigan was understood to be decidedly in favor of the Wilmot Proviso; and, as no reason had been stated for the change, he (Mr. Miller) could not refrain from the expression of his extreme surprise."

To this Gen. Cass is reported to have replied as follows, to-wit:

"Mr. Cass said, that the course of the Senator from New Jersey was most extraordinary. Last year he (Mr. Cass) should have voted for the proposition had it come up. But circumstances had altogether changed. The honorable Senator then read several passages from the remarks as given above, which he had committed to writing, in order to refute such a charge as that of the Senator from New Jersey."

In the "remarks above committed to writing," is one numbered 4, as follows, to-wit :

"4th. Legislation would now be wholly imperative, because no territory hereafter to be acquired can be governed without an act of Congress providing for its government. And such an act, on its passage, would open the whole subject, and leave the Congress, called on to pass it, free to exercise its own discretion, entirely uncontrolled by any declaration found in the statute book."

In Niles' Register, vol. 73, page 293, there is a letter of Gen. Cass to A. O. P. Nicholson, of Nashville, Tennessee, dated December 24, 1847, from which the following are correct extracts :

"The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. I am strongly impressed with the opinion that a great change has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in my own as well as others; and that doubts are resolving themselves into convictions, that the principle it involves should be kept out of the National Legislature, and left to the people of the Confederacy in their respective local Governments. * * * * *

"Briefly, then, I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter; and I am in favor of leaving the people of any territory which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it themselves, under the general principles of the Constitution. Because,

"1. I do not see in the Constitution any grant of the requisite power to Congress; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessity—the establishment of territorial governments when needed—leaving to the inhabitants all the rights compatible with the relations they bear to the Confederation."

AN OBEDIENT DEMOCRAT.

These extracts show that, in 1846, Gen. Cass was for the Proviso *at once*; that, in March, 1847, he was still for it, *but not just then*; and that in December, 1847, he was *against* it altogether. This is a true index to the whole man. When the question was raised in 1846, he was in a blustering hurry to take ground for it. He sought to be in advance, and to avoid the uninteresting position of a mere follower; but soon he began to see glimpses of the great Democratic ox-gad waving in his face, and to hear indistinctly, a voice saying, "back," "back, sir," "back a little." He shakes his head and bats his eyes, and blunders back to his position of March, 1847; but

still the gad waves, and the voice grows more distinct, and sharper still—"back, sir!" "back, I say!" "further back!" and back he goes to the position of December, 1847; at which the gad is still, and the voice soothingly says—"So!" "Stand still at that."

Have no fears, gentlemen, of your candidate; he exactly suits you, and we congratulate you upon it. However much you may be distressed about *our* candidate, you have all cause to be contented and happy with your own. If elected, he may not maintain all, or even any of his positions previously taken; but he will be sure to do whatever the party exigency, for the time being, may require; and that is precisely what you want. He and Van Buren are the same "manner of men;" and like Van Buren, he will never desert *you* till you first desert *him*.

[After referring at some length to extra "charges" of Gen. Cass upon the Treasury, Mr. Lincoln continued:—]

WONDERFUL PHYSICAL CAPACITIES.

But I have introduced Gen. Cass's accounts here, chiefly to show the wonderful physical capacities of the man. They show that he not only did the labor of several men at the same *time*, but that he often did it, at several *places* many hundred miles apart, *at the same time*. And at eating, too, his capacities are shown to be quite as wonderful. From October, 1821, to May, 1822, he ate ten rations a day in Michigan, ten rations a day here, in Washington, and near five dollar's worth a day besides, partly on the road between the two places. And then there is an important discovery in his example—the art of being paid for what one eats, instead of having to pay for it. Hereafter, if any nice young man shall owe a bill which he can not pay in any other way, he can just board it out. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard of the animal standing in doubt between two stacks of hay, and starving to death; the like of that would never happen to Gen. Cass. Place the stacks a thousand miles apart, he would stand stock-still, midway between them, and eat them both at once; and the green grass along the line would be apt to suffer some too, at the same time. By all means, make him President, gentlemen. He will feed you bounteously—if—if there is any left after he shall have helped himself.

THE WHIGS AND THE MEXICAN WAR.

But as Gen. Taylor, is, par excellence, the hero of the Mexican war; and, as you Democrats say we Whigs have always

opposed the war, you think it must be very awkward and embarrassing for us to go for Gen. Taylor. The declaration that we have always opposed the war, is true or false accordingly as one may understand the term "opposing the war." If to say "the war was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President," be opposing the war, then the Whigs have very generally opposed it. Whenever they have spoken at all, they have said this; and they have said it on what has appeared good reason to them: The marching an army into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement, frightening the inhabitants away, leaving their growing crops and other property to destruction, to *you* may appear a perfectly amiable, peaceful, unprovoking procedure; but it does not appear so to *us*. So to call such an act, to us appears no other than a naked, impudent absurdity, and we speak of it accordingly. But if, when the war had begun, and had become the cause of the country, the giving of our money and our blood, in common with yours, was support of the war, then it is not true that we have always opposed the war. With few individual exceptions, you have constantly had our votes here for all the necessary supplies. And, more than this, you have had the services, the blood, and the lives of our political brethren in every trial, and on every field. The beardless boy and the mature man—the humble and the distinguished, you have had them. Through suffering and death, by disease and in battle, they have endured, and fought, and fallen with you. Clay and Webster each gave a son, never to be returned. From the State of my own residence, besides other worthy but less known Whig names, we sent Marshall, Morrison, Baker, and Hardin; they all fought, and one fell, and in the fall of that one, we lost our best Whig man. Nor were the Whigs few in number, or laggard in the day of danger. In that fearful, bloody, breathless struggle at Buena Vista, where each man's hard task was to beat back five foes, or die himself, of the five high officers who perished, four were Whigs.

In speaking of this, I mean no odious comparison between the lion-hearted Whigs and Democrats who fought there. On other occasions, and among the lower officers and privates on *that* occasion, I doubt not the proportion was different. I wish to do justice to all. I think of all those brave men as Americans, in whose proud fame, as an American, I too have a share. Many of them, Whigs and Democrats, are my constituents and personal friends; and I thank them—more than thank them—one and all, for the high, imperishable honor they have conferred on our common State.

AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION.

But the distinction between the cause of the *President* in beginning the war, and the cause of the *country* after it was begun, is a distinction which you can not perceive. To *you*, the President and the country seem to be all one. You are interested to see no distinction between them; and I venture to suggest that *possibly* your interest blinds you a little. We see the distinction, as we think, clearly enough; and our friends, who have fought in the war, have no difficulty in seeing it also. What those who have fallen would say, were they alive and here, of course we can never know; but with those who have returned there is no difficulty. Col. Haskell and Maj. Gaines, members here, both fought in the war; and one of them underwent extraordinary perils and hardships; still they, like all other Whigs here, vote on the record that the war was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President. And even Gen. Taylor himself, the noblest Roman of them all, has declared that, as a citizen, and particularly as a soldier, it is sufficient for him to know that his country is at war with a foreign nation, to do all in his power to bring it to a speedy and honorable termination, by the most vigorous and energetic operations, without inquiring about its justice, or anything else connected with it.

Mr. Speaker, let our Democratic friends be comforted with the assurance that we are content with our position, content with our company, and content with our candidate; and that although they, in their generous sympathy, think we ought to be miserable, we really are not, and that they may dismiss the great anxiety they have on *our* account.

Mr. Lincoln concluded with some allusions to the then divided condition of the New York Democracy.

This session of Congress came to a close on the 14th day of August. The chief points of Mr. Lincoln's Congressional record, thus far, have been noticed, and his principal speeches given at length. He stood firmly by the side of John Quincy Adams, in favor of the unrestricted right of petition, as will be seen by his vote, among others, against laying on the table a petition presented by Caleb B. Smith (December 27, 1847) praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. He favored a liberal policy toward the people in disposing of the public lands, as indicated by

his imperfectly reported remarks (May 11, 1848), at the time of the passage of the bill admitting Wisconsin into the Union as a State. He was careful to scrutinize particular claims, to satisfy which he was asked to vote for an appropriation, as in the case of the proposition to pay the Texas volunteers for lost horses (May 4, 1848). All his acts show a purpose to do his duty to the country, no less than to his immediate constituents, without fear or favor.

After the session closed, Mr. Lincoln made a visit to New England, where he delivered some effective campaign speeches, which were enthusiastically received by his large audiences, as appears from the reports in the journals of those days, and as will be remembered by thousands. His time, however, was chiefly given, during the Congressional recess, to the canvass in the West, where, through the personal strength of Mr. Cass as a North-western man, the contest was more severe and exciting than in any other part of the country. The final triumph of Gen. Taylor, over all the odds against him, did much to counterbalance, in Mr. Lincoln's mind, the disheartening defeat of four years previous. As before stated, he had declined to be a candidate for re-election to Congress, yet he had the satisfaction of aiding to secure, in his own district, a majority of 1,500 for the Whig Presidential candidates.

Mr. Lincoln again took his seat in the House in December, on the reassembling of the thirtieth Congress for its second session. Coming between the Presidential election, which had effected a political revolution, and the inauguration of the new Government, this session was generally a quiet one, passing away without any very important measures of general legislation being acted upon. A calm had followed the recent storms. There were, indeed, certain movements in regard to slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, which produced some temporary excitement, but resulted in no serious commotion. On the 21st of December, Mr. Gott, a representative from New York, introduced a resolution, accompanied by a strong preamble instructing the Committee on the District of Columbia to report a bill prohibiting the slave-trade in the District. The language used was as follows :

WHEREAS, The traffic now prosecuted in this metropolis of the Republic in human beings, as chattels, is contrary to natural justice and the fundamental principles of our political system, and is notoriously a reproach to our country throughout Christendom, and a serious hindrance to the progress of republican liberty among the nations of the earth: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee for the District of Columbia be instructed to report a bill, as soon as practicable, prohibiting the slave-trade in said District.

Mr. Haralson, of Georgia, moved to lay the same on the table, and the yeas and nays were taken on his motion. Mr. Lincoln, Joseph R. Ingersoll, Richard W. Thompson, and George G. Dunn, were nearly or quite the only Northern Whigs who voted in the affirmative. The motion was lost, and the resolution, under pressure of the previous question, was adopted, ninety-eight to eighty-eight, Mr. Lincoln voting in the negative. A motion to reconsider this vote came up for action on the 27th of the same month. A motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider having been lost, (yeas 58, nays 107—Mr. Lincoln voting in the negative), the subject was postponed until the 10th of January. At that date, Mr. Lincoln read a substitute which he proposed to offer for the resolution, in case of a reconsideration. This substitute contained the form of a bill enacting that no person not already within the District should be held in slavery therein, and providing for the gradual emancipation of the slaves already within the District, with compensation to the owners, if a majority of the legal voters of the District should assent to the act, at an election to be holden for the purpose. It made an exception of the right of citizens of the slaveholding States, coming to the District on public business, to "be attended into and out of said District, and while there, by the necessary servants of themselves and their families." These were the chief provisions of the measure contemplated by Mr. Lincoln, which compared favorably with the act prohibiting the slave-trade in the District, included among the Compromise measures of 1850. After rehearsing the details of his bill, according to the report in the *Congressional Globe*—

Mr. Lincoln then said, that he was authorized to say, that

of about fifteen of the leading citizens of the District of Columbia to whom this proposition had been submitted, there was no one but who approved of the adoption of such a proposition. He did not wish to be misunderstood. He did not know whether or not they would vote for this bill on the first Monday of April; but he repeated, that out of fifteen persons to whom it had been submitted, he had authority to say that every one of them desired that some proposition like this should pass.

A motion to lay on the table the proposition to reconsider was again lost, and by a much larger majority than before, and the resolution was reconsidered, 119 to 81. Mr. Smith, of Indiana, then moved the following substitute:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be instructed to report, as soon as practicable, a bill so amending the present law in this District, as effectually to prevent the bringing of slaves into the District, either for sale here, or to be sold and carried to any place beyond the District.

Mr. Meade, of Virginia, offered the following as an amendment to Mr. Smith's amendment:

And that the said committee is hereby instructed to report a bill more effectually to enable owners to recover their slaves escaping from one State into another.

Here, it is observable, are two of the propositions which were ultimately embraced in the great Compromise "settlement" of 1850, and these several amendments, proposed by Mr. Lincoln and others, may be termed the springs, in Congress, from which flowed a portion of that celebrated series of measures.

The Speaker (Mr. Winthrop) ruled Mr. Meade's amendment out of order, and without any decisive action thereon, the House adjourned, leaving the resolution and amendments to disappear among the files of unfinished business on the Speaker's table.

An unsuccessful attempt had previously been made by Mr. Palfrey, of Massachusetts, a Free-Soil member who refused to vote for Mr. Winthrop for Speaker, to introduce a bill "to repeal all acts, or parts of acts, of Congress establishing or maintaining slavery or the slave-trade in the District of Colum-

bia." Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina, having objected, the yeas and nays were taken on granting the leave asked, and the negative prevailed by thirteen majority. The Northern Whigs in general, excepting Messrs. Vinton and Dunn, and many Northern Democrats, including John Wentworth, David Wilmot, and J. J. Faran, of Ohio, voted in the affirmative. Mr. Lincoln's name is recorded among the nays. So sweeping and unqualified a measure he has ever been opposed to, as he avowed himself to be in 1858, and has never hesitated, from a fear of popular misapprehension, to vote in strict accordance with his own convictions.

On the 31st of January, Mr. Edwards, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported a bill, suitably guarded in its terms, prohibiting the slave-trade in the District. On a motion to lay this on the table, Mr. Lincoln voted in the negative, with the friends of that measure, who were a majority. This bill, however, passed over among the unfinished business of the session.

In regard to the grant of public lands to the new States, to aid in the construction of railroads and canals, Mr. Lincoln favored the interests of his own constituents, under such reasonable restrictions as the proper carrying out of the purpose of these grants required. This policy had been strongly opposed by Mr. Vinton, while one of the bills of this sort was pending. In the brief remarks which Mr. Lincoln offered in reply, there are some points (*Congressional Globe*, page 533) worth quoting here :

In relation to the fact assumed, that, after a while, the new States, having got hold of the public lands to a certain extent, would turn round and compel Congress to relinquish all claim to them, he had a word to say, by way of recurring to the history of the past. When was the time to come (he asked) when the States in which the public lands were situated would compose a majority of the representation in Congress, or any thing like it. A majority of Representatives would very soon reside West of the mountains, he admitted ; but would they all come from States in which the public lands were situated ? They certainly would not ; for, as these Western States grew strong in Congress, the public lands passed away from them, and they got on the other side

of the question, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vinton) was an example attesting that fact.

Mr. Vinton interrupted here to say, that he had stood upon this question just where he was now, for five-and-twenty years.

Mr. Lincoln was not making an argument for the purpose of convicting the gentleman of any impropriety at all. He was speaking of a fact in history, of which his State was an example. He was referring to a plain principle in the nature of things. The State of Ohio had now grown to be a giant. She had a large delegation on that floor; but was she now in favor of granting lands to the new States as she used to be? The New England States, New York, and the Old Thirteen, were all rather quiet upon the subject; and it was seen just now that a member from one of the new States was the first man to rise up in opposition. And so it would be with the history of this question for the future. There never would come a time when the people residing in the States embracing the public lands would have the entire control of this subject; and so it was a matter of certainty that Congress would never do more in this respect than what would be dictated by a just liberality. The apprehension, therefore, that the public lands were in danger of being wrested from the General Government by the strength of the delegation in Congress from the new States, was utterly futile. There never could be such a thing. If we take these lands (said he) it will not be without your consent. We can never outnumber you. The result is, that all fear of the new States turning against the right of Congress to the public domain must be effectually quelled, as those who are opposed to that interest must always hold a vast majority here, and they will never surrender the whole or any part of the public lands unless they themselves choose so to do. This was all he desired to say.

With the termination of the Thirtieth Congress, by Constitutional limitation, on the 4th of March, 1849, Mr. Lincoln's career as a Congressman came to a close. He had refused to be a candidate for re-election in a district that had given him over 1,500 majority in 1846, and nearly the same to General Taylor, as the Whig candidate for the Presidency in 1848. It does not appear that he desired or would have accepted any place at Washington among the many at the disposal of the incoming Administration, in whose behalf he had so zealously labored. He retired once more to private life, renewing the

professional practice which had been temporarily interrupted by his public employment. The duties of his responsible position had been discharged with assiduity and with fearless adherence to his convictions of right, under whatever circumstances. Scarcely a list of yeas and nays can be found, for either session, which does not contain his name. He was never conveniently absent on any critical vote. He never shrank from any responsibility which his sense of justice impelled him to take. His record, comparatively brief as it is, is no doubtful one, and will bear the closest scrutiny. And though one of the youngest and most inexperienced members of an uncommonly able and brilliant Congress, he would long have been remembered, without the more recent events which have naturally followed upon his previous career, as standing among the first in rank of the distinguished statesmen of the Thirtieth Congress.

CHAPTER IX.

PROFESSIONAL LIFE.—THE ANTI-NEBRASKA CANVASS.—
1849—1854.

Mr. Lincoln in Retirement for Five Years.—Gen. Taylor's Administration.—The Slavery Agitation of 1850.—The Compromise of Clay and Fillmore.—The "Final Settlement" of 1852.—How, and by Whom it was Disturbed.—Violation of the Most Positive Pledges.—The Kansas-Nebraska Bill.—Douglas, the Agitator.—Popular Indignation and Excitement.—Mr. Lincoln Takes Part in the Canvass of 1854.—Great Political Changes.—The Anti-Nebraska Organization.—Springfield Resolutions of 1854.—Results of the Election.—A Majority of Congressmen and of the Legislature Anti-Nebraska.—Election of United States Senator to Succeed Gen. Shields.—Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Trumbull.—A Magnanimous Sacrifice.—Mr. Trumbull Elected.

DURING the five years immediately following the close of his Congressional life, Mr. Lincoln attentively pursued his profession of the law. He took no active part in politics through the period of Gen. Taylor's administration, or in any of the exciting scenes of 1850. His great political leader, Henry Clay, had resumed his place in the Senate, and was earnestly striving—one of the last great labors of his life—to avert the dangers to the country, which he believed to be threatened by the fierce contests over the question of Slavery. It was, with the slave States, a desperate struggle to retain the balance of power in the Senate, by rejecting the application of another free State for admission, the granting of which would destroy the exact equilibrium then existing. The policy of admitting a slave State along with every new free one, had substantially prevailed for years; but, at this time, despite the extensive additions of Mexican territory, there was no counterbalancing slave State ready for admission. The exclusion of slavery

from California had, in fact, been rather a surprise, and this application was evidently still more an irritating circumstance for that reason. And yet this movement was in strict accordance with the policy of a Southern President. As a final result, the admission of California was only carried by means of great counterbalancing concessions on the part of the free States. For months after, there was much discontent in both sections, in regard to the compromise measures of 1850, which were defeated in Congress, when first acted upon as a whole, but were ultimately carried in detail. It was not until 1852, when both the great parties of the country agreed to accept those measures as a "final settlement" of the slavery controversy, that public sentiment, North and South, appeared to have become fully reconciled to this adjustment. The Administration, brought into power by the election of that year, was most thoroughly and sacredly committed to the maintenance of this settlement, and against the revival of the Slavery agitation in any form. To introduce that subject, under any pretense, into the halls of Congress, was an act of wanton incendiarism, in utter disregard of most solemn pledges, by the aid of which the Democratic party had secured whatever real hold it had upon popular confidence. Such was the state of affairs in 1852, and at the time of Mr. Pierce's inauguration in 1853.

Mr. Lincoln, as a private citizen, engrossed with his professional duties, had borne no part in the original controversy, and had taken no share in its settlement. Whether preferring the non-intervention policy of President Taylor, or the compromise course of Clay and Fillmore, he had undoubtedly regarded the peace established, by means of the latter, as one that ought by all means to be preserved, and the pledges of both sections of the country, through the action of both the national parties, as religiously binding upon every public man who had openly or tacitly assented thereto. That he approved all the details of this compromise is not probable. But that, if faithfully adhered to, the practical results would have been satisfactory, he was undoubtedly convinced.

The introduction of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, in 1854, in the midst of this profound peace on the slavery question, was

“the alarm of the fire-bell at night” which startled Mr. Lincoln in the repose of his private life, and showed that the incendiary had but too successfully been at his work. The solemn pledge of peace had been violated by the very men who were most forward in making it, and most noisy in their professions of a desire that the slavery conflict should cease. This new agitating movement, not only unsettling all the more recent stipulations made for the sake of peace, but even going back to destroy the only condition yet assailable, of the Compromise of 1820, and that the very portion which was agreed on as a consideration to the free States, was led by the ambitious politician of Illinois, Stephen A. Douglas. Not only had this unscrupulous agitator committed himself as fully as man could do to the maintenance of peace on this question, after the compromise of 1850, but he had, a year previous, called down vengeance upon the hand that would dare disturb the time-honored Missouri compact—that settlement which secured freedom “forever” to the soil embraced within the limits of Kansas and Nebraska. Yet the first hand raised for the commission of this incalculable wrong was his own! Douglas himself reported the act which violated that compact, and which opened the new territories to slavery (professedly, not really, at the option of the people), contrary to the spirit of all the early legislation, and to the hitherto uniform course of the Government. Even he himself had recently voted for the Wilmot Proviso as applied to the territory acquired from Mexico, and Mr. Polk had approved the Oregon bill, containing the same restriction. Never was there more universal indignation among the people of the North, and many of the more sagacious statesmen of the South clearly foresaw the mischiefs that were to follow from this sacrilege. Yet strange to say, this measure sundered and broke up the Whig party forever, through the action of a large portion of the Southern Whig Congressmen, in joining the Democracy in this act of bad faith, for the sake of supposed sectional advantage. The most intense excitement prevailed throughout the country, and the destruction of the old party lines was effectually accomplished.

These events called forth Mr. Lincoln once more to do battle for the right. He entered into the canvass of 1854, as one of the most active leaders of the "Anti-Nebraska" movement. He addressed the people repeatedly from the stump, with all his characteristic earnestness and energy. He met and cowed the author of the "Nebraska iniquity," in the presence of the masses, and powerfully aided in effecting the remarkable political changes of that year in Illinois.

The incendiary act had come to the final vote, in the Senate, on the 26th day of May. About the first of August, Congress adjourned. Douglas lingered by the way on his return to his constituents, and reached Chicago near the close of that month. Here he met a storm of indignation from the people, whom for manifesting their disapprobation of his conduct, he complacently termed a "mob." He had proposed to speak in self-vindication, on the evening of the first day of September. He was received with the most decisive demonstrations of popular indignation, which he attempted to face down with an insufferable insolence of manner, that only tended to increase the excitement against him. After long perseverance in an attempt to *compel* a hearing, he was forced to succumb. All over the State he early discovered the same state of feeling existed among a large portion of his constituents, although there was no refusal to hear him, except in this first unlucky effort to defy and silence a crowd by bullying deportment. The popular rage gradually subsided, but the deliberate sentiment of the people of Illinois on this subject has only been confirmed and strengthened against him with time. From commanding a large majority of the popular vote, as he had done previously, his strength dwindled away, until, for years past, he and the party that sustained him, have been in a positive minority in the State. The reader can judge how much this, to him, painful truth, had to do with the change of policy adopted by him, in opposing the Lecompton Constitution, the legitimate fruit of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and substantially approved by him in advance, in a speech made in Springfield, in 1857.

Mr. Douglas visited several parts of the State, vainly attempt-

ing, by ingenious but sophistical addresses to the people to avert the impending revolution. Mr. Lincoln met him in debate at Springfield, during the time of the State Fair, early in October, 1854, and the encounter was a memorable one in the great campaign then in progress. They met a few days later at Peoria, where Mr. Douglas had no better fortune. Subsequently to that encounter, he showed a decided preference for speaking at other times and places than Mr. Lincoln.

The Anti-Nebraska organization, formed at Springfield in October of that year, and embracing men of all parties opposed to the reckless measures which had introduced the most violent agitation in regard to slavery ever known in the country, was the beginning from which the Republican party in Illinois was to be matured. Among the resolutions at that time adopted, after setting forth in a preamble that a majority of Congress had deliberately and wantonly re-opened the controversy respecting the extension of slavery under our national jurisdiction, which a majority of the people had understood to be closed forever by the successive compromises of 1820 and 1850, were the following :

Resolved, That the doctrine affirmed by the Nebraska Bill, and gilded over by its advocates with the specious phrases of non-intervention and popular sovereignty, is really and clearly a complete surrender of all the ground hitherto asserted and maintained by the Federal Government, with respect to the limitation of slavery, is a plain confession of the right of the slaveholder to transfer his human chattels to any part of the public domain, and there hold them as slaves as long as inclination or interest may dictate; and that this is an attempt totally to reverse the doctrine hitherto uniformly held by statesmen and jurists, that slavery is the creature of local and State law, and to make it a national institution.

Resolved, That as freedom is national and slavery sectional and local, the absence of all law upon the subject of slavery presumes the existence of a state of freedom alone, while slavery exists only by virtue of positive law.

Resolved, That we heartily approve the course of the freemen of Connecticut, Vermont, Iowa, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, New York, Michigan and Maine, postponing or disregarding their minor difference of opinion or preferences, and acting together cordially and trustingly in the same cause of freedom,

of free labor, and free soil, and we commend their spirit to the freemen of this and other States, exhorting each to renounce his party whenever and wherever that party proves unfaithful to human freedom.

In behalf of these principles, Mr. Lincoln had already taken the stump, and for them he did valiant service in various parts of the State.

This new party was organized late in the season, and the canvass for Treasurer, the only State officer to be elected, was but imperfectly made. In some parts of the State, there was even no distribution of tickets containing the name of this candidate. The result, even under these unfavorable circumstances, and in spite of the overwhelming Democratic preponderance during the previous twenty-five years, was extremely close, and for a long time doubtful. The Democratic candidate barely escaped defeat. This was the last election in which the party sustaining Douglas has had even the appearance of a majority in Illinois. *The revolution was now substantially accomplished.* From that day to the present the Opposition party has been steadily gaining in strength, and that of Mr. Douglas sinking more and more into a hopeless minority. Even the temporary reaction, under the Anti-Lecompton flag, was more apparent than real.

Of the nine Congressional Districts, the Opposition now, for the first time, carried a majority, electing five members, and the Democrats four. The Legislature would have been completely revolutionized, in both branches, with little doubt, but for the large number of Democrats "holding over," as members of the new Senate. In the House, the Anti-Nebraska representatives numbered forty, and the Democratic thirty-five. In the Senate, there were seventeen elected as Democrats, and eight as Opposition men. Of the former, however, there were three, elected two years previously, who repudiated Douglas and his policy, and inclined to the Opposition. These were Norman B. Judd, J. M. Palmer, and B. C. Cook. Reckoning these with the Anti-Nebraska side, the Senate stood, Opposition eleven, Democrats fourteen—leaving a

majority against the Douglas Democracy of two on joint ballot.

A United States Senator, to succeed Gen. Shields on the 4th of March, 1855, was to be chosen by this Legislature. For the first time in the history of Illinois, the election of an Opposition Senator was within the reach of possibility. Mr. Lincoln was the first choice of the great mass of the Opposition for this position. From his prominence, for a long time, in the old Whig party, it was but natural that a portion of the members having Democratic antecedents who had come into the new organization, should hesitate to give Mr. Lincoln their votes. This was especially true of the three Senators above named as holding over, they having been elected as regular Democrats. Under this state of things, it was manifest, after a few ballots, that, with the close vote in joint convention the election of a Democrat, not to be certainly relied on as an opponent of the Douglas policy, and at best uncommitted in regard to the new party organization, might be the result of adhering to Mr. Lincoln. He, accordingly, with the self-sacrificing disposition which had always characterized him, promptly appealed to his Whig friends to go over in a solid body to Mr. Trumbull, a man of Democratic antecedents, who could command the full vote of the Anti-Nebraska Democrats. By these earnest and disinterested efforts, the difficult task was accomplished, great as was the sacrifice of personal feeling which it cost the devoted friends of Mr. Lincoln. On the part of himself and them, it involved the exercise of a degree of self-denial and magnanimity, as rare as it was noble. It demonstrated their honest attachment to the great cause for which old party lines had been abandoned, and their sincere purpose of thoroughly ignoring all differences founded on mere partizan prejudice. It cemented the union of these Anti-Nebraska elements, and consolidated the new organization into a permanent party.

The joint convention for electing a United States Senator met on the 8th day of February, 1855. On the first ballot, James Shields, then Senator, who had been induced by

Douglas, against his own better judgment, to vote for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, received 41 votes, and three other Democrats had one vote each. Abraham Lincoln had 45 votes, Lyman Trumbull 5, Mr. Koerner 2, and there were three other scattering votes. On the seventh ballot, the Democratic vote was concentrated upon Gov. Matteson, with two exceptions, and he received also the votes of two Anti-Nebraska Democrats, making 44 in all. On the tenth ballot, Mr. Trumbull was elected, in the way just explained, receiving 51 votes and Mr. Matteson 47. Every Whig vote but one was given to Mr. Trumbull.

Among the speeches delivered by Mr. Lincoln in this memorable campaign, which gave the Republicans an able Senator from Illinois, and which effectually accomplished the overthrow of the Democracy in that State, perhaps the ablest and most characteristic was the one delivered at Peoria, important portions of which were quoted by him in the canvass with Douglas, four years later.

CHAPTER X.

POLITICAL MOVEMENTS IN 1856 AND '57.

The Republican Party Organized.—Their Platform adopted at Bloomington.—The Canvass of 1856.—Mr. Lincoln Sustains Fremont and Dayton.—His Active Labors on the Stump.—Col. Bissell Elected Governor of Illinois.—Mr. Buchanan Inaugurated.—His Kansas Policy.—Mr. Douglas Committed to it in June, 1857.—John Calhoun His Special Friend.—The Springfield Speech of Douglas.—Mr. Lincoln's Reply.

MR. LINCOLN took an active part in the formation of the Republican party as such. The State convention of that organization which met at Bloomington, on the 29th of May, 1856, sent delegates to the Philadelphia Convention of that year, held for the nomination of Presidential candidates. The resolutions of the Bloomington Convention, in place of which Mr. Douglas produced an entirely different series on the stump, in 1858, are subjoined in full :

WHEREAS, The present Administration has prostituted its powers, and devoted all its energies to the propagation of slavery, and to its extension into Territories heretofore dedicated to freedom, against the known wishes of the people of such Territories, to the suppression of the freedom of speech, and of the press ; and to the revival of the odious doctrine of constructive treason, which has always been the resort of tyrants, and their most powerful engine of injustice and oppression ; *and whereas*, we are convinced that an effort is making to subvert the principles, and ultimately to change the form of our Government, and which it becomes all patriots, all who love their country, and the cause of human freedom, to resist ; therefore

Resolved, That foregoing all former differences of opinion upon other questions, we pledge ourselves to unite in opposition to the present Administration, and to the party which upholds and supports it, and to use all honorable and Constitutional

means to wrest the government from the unworthy hands which now control it, and to bring it back in its administration to the principles and practices of Washington, Jefferson and their great and good compatriots of the Revolution.

Resolved, That we hold, in accordance with the opinions and practices of all the great statesmen of all parties, for the first sixty years of the administration of the Government, that, under the Constitution, Congress possesses full power to prohibit slavery in the Territories; and that while we will maintain all Constitutional rights of the South, we also hold that justice, humanity, the principles of freedom as expressed in our Declaration of Independence, and our National Constitution, and the purity and perpetuity of our Government require that that power should be exerted, to prevent the extension of slavery into Territories heretofore free.

Resolved, That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was unwise, unjust and injurious; in open and aggravated violation of the plighted faith of the States, and that the attempt of the present Administration to force slavery into Kansas against the known wishes of the legal voters of that Territory, is an arbitrary and tyrannous violation of the rights of the people to govern themselves, and that we will strive by all Constitutional means, to secure to Kansas and Nebraska the legal guaranty against slavery, of which they were deprived, at the cost of the violation of the plighted faith of the nation.

Resolved, That we are devoted to the Union, and will, to the last extremity, defend it against the efforts now being made by the Disunionists of this Administration to compass its dissolution; and that we will support the Constitution of the United States in all its provisions, regarding it as the sacred bond of our Union, and the only safeguard for the preservation of the rights of ourselves and our posterity.

Resolved, That we are in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas as a member of this Confederacy, under the Constitution adopted by the people of said Territory.

Resolved, That the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantees the liberty of conscience as well as political freedom, and that we will proscribe no one by legislation or otherwise, on account of religious opinions, or in consequence of place of birth.

Resolved, That in Lyman Trumbull, our distinguished Senator, the people of Illinois have an able and consistent exponent of their principles, and that his course in the Senate meets with our unqualified approbation.

With this creed, and the Philadelphia platform, subsequently adopted, the Republicans of Illinois went into the canvass of 1856. Mr. Lincoln labored earnestly during the campaign, sustaining the nominations of FREMONT and DAYTON. In the State canvass, Col. Wm. H. Bissel received the united support of the Opposition for Governor, and was elected by a decisive majority. On the Presidential candidates, there being, unfortunately, two tickets in the field, the divided Opposition were unsuccessful, although Fremont, in spite of the heavy Fillmore vote ran so closely upon Buchanan that the result was for a time in doubt, and only the nearly solid vote of "Egypt" decided the result in favor of the latter. The untiring exertions of Mr. Lincoln on the stump, in enlightening the people as to the real issues involved, did much toward securing this remarkable vote.

Mr. Buchanan came into power in March, 1857, and the hopes which had been entertained of a material change, under his administration, of the unjust and execrable policy hitherto pursued toward Kansas, were speedily dissipated. After some little show of resistance at first, he was soon found acting in accordance with the dictates of the extreme pro-slavery interest. A deep scheme was concocted, into the secrets of which even the Governor and Secretary of that Territory were not admitted, for forcing Kansas into the Union as a slave State. This plot began to be suspected, and its existence more and more confirmed by the course of events, not long after Mr. Buchanan's inauguration. The thin veil of "bogus Popular Sovereignty," with which Douglas had tried to hide the naked deformity of the act under which Kansas and Nebraska were organized, was to be rent asunder. People were beginning to look with curiosity for the next evasion or artful afterthought by which he would attempt to escape the force of a public sentiment which was already rapidly bearing him down, before this more complete exposure became inevitable. This interest in his course was the more lively, for the reason that his Senatorial term had nearly expired, and that, without some remarkable change of affairs, or some ingenious device, the curse he

had himself pronounced in evidence upon the disturber of the Missouri compact, was to be most signally realized.

Meantime, the machinery had been put in motion for a Convention at Lecompton, which was to ratify a Constitution prepared at Washington, under Administration auspices, and to secure the great purpose intended by the Southern supporters of the Kansas-Nebraska scheme. How grossly unjust and unequal were the provisions of the act calling this Convention, and how deliberate was its design of excluding the free State men from any effectual voice in determining "the domestic institutions" of a State in which the party of free labor comprised about four-fifths of the people, as had already been distinctly indicated, need not be here rehearsed. To Douglas, at least, the real facts were not unknown. That these iniquities must all ultimately come out, and receive the condemnation of the people, he can not have seriously questioned. Yet, in spite of these facts, it is undeniably true, and is clearly of record, that he committed himself in advance—not at all uncertain, most assuredly, as to what it was substantially to be—in favor of the Lecompton Constitution. John Calhoun, the chosen instrument of the Administration for carrying out its plot to defeat "Popular Sovereignty" in Kansas, was one of the special friends of Douglas, and understood to share his intimate confidence. And when, in his speech at Springfield, in June, 1857, Mr. Douglas substantially indorsed the Lecompton Convention and its doings, beforehand, no one had any reason to doubt that he intended fully to sustain the Administration in attempting to force a slave Constitution on the people of Kansas—a process for which his "organic act" had prepared the way. In the course of his remarks on that occasion, he said :

Kansas is about to *speak for herself* through her delegates assembled in convention to form a Constitution, preparatory to her admission into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. Peace and prosperity now prevail throughout her borders. The law under which her delegates are about to be elected is believed to be *just and fair in all its objects and provisions*. There is every reason to hope and believe that

the law will be fairly interpreted and impartially executed, so as to insure to every bona fide inhabitant the free and quiet exercise of the elective franchise. If any portion of the inhabitants, acting under the advice of political leaders in distant States, shall choose to absent themselves from the polls, and withhold their votes, with a view of leaving the free State Democrats in a minority, and thus securing a pro-slavery Constitution in opposition to the wishes of a majority of the people living under it, let the responsibility rest on those who, for partizan purposes, will sacrifice the principles they profess to cherish and promote. Upon them *and upon the political party for whose benefit and under the direction of whose leaders they act*, let the blame be visited of fastening upon the people of a new State institutions repugnant to their feelings and in violation of their wishes.

Words could not have more positively indicated his purpose of sustaining all the acts of the Lecompton Convention, or that he anticipated the formation of a pro-slavery Constitution, for which he meant to charge the blame upon the free State men and upon the Republican party in general, anticipating then that the non-voting policy would be adopted. In a subsequent part of this same speech, he still more fully and unreservedly indorsed the act providing for the Lecompton Constitutional Convention, committing himself to all its legitimate consequences. He said:

The present election law in Kansas is acknowledged to be fair and just—the rights of the voters are clearly defined—and the exercise of those rights will be efficiently and scrupulously protected. Hence, if the majority of the people of Kansas desire to have it a free State (and we are told by the Republican party that nine-tenths of the people of that Territory are free State men), *there is no obstacle in the way of bringing Kansas into the Union as a free State, by the votes and voice of her own people*, and in conformity with the great principles of the Kansas-Nebraska act; provided all the free State men will go to the polls, and vote their principles in accordance with their professions. If such is not the result, let the consequences be visited upon the heads of those whose policy it is to produce strife, anarchy, and bloodshed in Kansas, that their party may profit by slavery agitation in the northern States of this Union. That the Democrats in Kansas will perform their duty fearlessly and nobly, according to

the principles they cherish, I have no doubt, and that the result of the struggle will be such as will gladden the heart and strengthen the hopes of every friend of the Union, I have entire confidence.

The Lecompton Convention was to settle the whole Kansas controversy, "peacefully and satisfactorily," according to the professed faith of Mr. Douglas. He fully indorsed it in its origin, and committed himself to abide by its results, which were accomplished through the instrumentality of one of his warmest personal friends. And what these results would be, in his opinion, he clearly foreshadowed in the extracts above given from his speech. He expected a pro-slavery Constitution, and he repeatedly approved, without any reservation, the convention-act which, by its regular carrying-out, accomplished that expectation. He declared, substantially, that the will of the people could be fully and fairly expressed in forming a Constitution at Lecompton, under that act; and that if they did not obtain such a Constitution as they desired, it would be *their own fault*—plainly implying that they must submit to such action as should be taken. He left himself scarcely a loophole of retreat, whatever might come of the Lecompton Convention.

In the same speech Mr. Douglas spoke at length in indorsement of the dogmas embraced in what is popularly called the Dred Scott decision, and particularly of the one which denies the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories. He tried, also, to convey the impression that the Republican party was in favor of negro equality, because dissenting in general to a judicial opinion, of which one of the details is a denial to the negro race of any legal redress for wrongs in the higher courts.

A third subject of this speech was the Utah rebellion, which Mr. Douglas proposed to end by annulling the act establishing the Territory of Utah.

To this speech Mr. Lincoln replied at Springfield, two weeks later. It is noticeable that the first two of the topics of Mr. Douglas's speech formed leading subjects of the great canvass of the next year. It is not impossible that this prompt joining

of issues may have had its influence in inducing Mr. Douglas so completely to change front, before another twelve-month had passed. In any event, these two speeches have a rare interest, from their immediate relations to the coming contest, of which they are properly the prelude. We give Mr. Lincoln's remarks at length :

SPEECH OF MR. LINCOLN, IN REPLY TO MR. DOUGLAS, ON KANSAS,
THE DRED SCOTT DECISION, AND THE UTAH QUESTION.

(*Delivered at Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857.*)

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—I am here, to-night, partly by the invitation of some of you, and partly by my own inclination. Two weeks ago Judge Douglas spoke here, on the several subjects of Kansas, the Dred Scott decision, and Utah. I listened to the speech at the time, and have read the report of it since. It was intended to controvert opinions which I think just, and to assail (politically, not personally) those men who, in common with me, entertain those opinions. For this reason I wished then, and still wish to make some answer to it, which I now take the opportunity of doing.

I begin with Utah. If it prove to be true, as is probable, that the people of Utah are in open rebellion against the United States, then Judge Douglas is in favor of repealing their territorial organization, and attaching them to the adjoining States for judicial purposes. I say, too, if they are in rebellion, they ought to be somehow coerced to obedience; and I am not now prepared to admit or deny, that the Judge's mode of coercing them is not as good as any. The Republicans can fall in with it, without taking back anything they have ever said. To be sure, it would be a considerable backing down by Judge Douglas, from his much vaunted doctrine of self-government for the territories; but this is only additional proof of what was very plain from the beginning, that that doctrine was a mere deceitful pretense for the benefit of slavery. Those who could not see that much in the Nebraska act itself, which forced Governors, and Secretaries, and Judges on the people of the territories, without their choice or consent, could not be made to see, though one should rise from the dead.

But in all this, it is very plain the Judge evades the only question the Republicans have ever pressed upon the Democracy in regard to Utah. That question the Judge well knew to be this: "If the people of Utah shall peacefully form a State Constitution tolerating polygamy, will the Democracy admit them into the Union?" There is nothing in the United States Constitution or law against polygamy; and why is it

not a part of the Judge's "sacred right of self-government" for the people to have it, or rather to keep it, if they choose? These questions, so far as I know, the Judge never answers. It might involve the Democracy to answer them either way, and they go unanswered.

As to Kansas. The substance of the Judge's speech on Kansas is an effort to put the Free State men in the wrong for not voting at the election of delegates to the Constitutional Convention. He says: "There is every reason to hope and believe that the law will be fairly interpreted and impartially executed, so as to insure to every bona fide inhabitant the free and quiet exercise of the elective franchise."

It appears extraordinary that Judge Douglas should make such a statement. He knows that, by the law, no one can vote who has not been registered; and he knows that the Free State men place their refusal to vote on the ground that but few of them have been registered. It is possible this is not true, but Judge Douglas knows it is asserted to be true in letters, newspapers and public speeches, and borne by every mail, and blown by every breeze to the eyes and ears of the world. He knows it is boldly declared, that the people of many whole counties, and many whole neighborhoods in others, are left unregistered; yet, he does not venture to contradict the declaration, or to point out how they can vote without being registered; but he just slips along, not seeming to know there is any such question of fact, and complacently declares, "There is every reason to hope and believe that the law will be fairly and impartially executed, so as to insure to every bona fide inhabitant the free and quiet exercise of the elective franchise."

I readily agree that if all had a chance to vote, they ought to have voted. If, on the contrary, as they allege, and Judge Douglas ventures not particularly to contradict, few only of the free State men had a chance to vote, they were perfectly right in staying from the polls in a body.

By the way, since the Judge spoke, the Kansas election has come off. The Judge expressed his confidence that all the Democrats in Kansas would do their duty—including "free State Democrats" of course. The returns received here, as yet, are very incomplete; but, so far as they go, they indicate that only about one-sixth of the registered voters, have really voted; and this too, when not more, perhaps, than one-half of the rightful voters have been registered, thus showing the thing to have been altogether the most exquisite farce ever enacted. I am watching with considerable interest, to ascertain what figure "the free State Democrats" cut in the concern. Of course they voted—all Democrats do their duty—

and of course they did not vote for slave State candidates. We soon shall know how many delegates they elected, how many candidates they had pledged to a free State, and how many votes were cast for them.

Allow me to barely whisper my suspicion, that there were no such things in Kansas as "free State Democrats"—that they were altogether mythical, good only to figure in newspapers and speeches in the free States. If there should prove to be one real, living free State Democrat in Kansas, I suggest that it might be well to catch him, and stuff and preserve his skin, as an interesting specimen of that soon to be extinct variety of the genus Democrat.

And now, as to the Dred Scott decision. That decision declares two propositions—first, that a negro can not sue in the United States Courts; and secondly, that Congress can not prohibit slavery in the Territories. It was made by a divided court—dividing differently on the different points. Judge Douglas does not discuss the merits of the decision, and in that respect, I shall follow his example, believing I could no more improve upon McLean and Curtis, than he could on Taney.

He denounces all who question the correctness of that decision, as offering violent resistance to it. But who resists it? Who has, in spite of the decision, declared Dred Scott free, and resisted the authority of his master over him?

Judicial decisions have two uses—first, to absolutely determine the case decided; and secondly, to indicate to the public how other similar cases will be decided when they arise. For the latter use, they are called "precedents" and "authorities."

We believe as much as Judge Douglas (perhaps more) in obedience to, and respect for the judicial department of Government. We think its decisions on Constitutional questions, when fully settled, should control, not only the particular cases decided, but the general policy of the country, subject to be disturbed only by amendments of the Constitution, as provided in that instrument itself. More than this would be revolution. But we think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the court that made it, has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it.

Judicial decisions are of greater or less authority as precedents, according to circumstances. That this should be so, accords both with common sense, and the customary understanding of the legal profession.

If this important decision had been made by the unanimous concurrence of the judges, and without any apparent partisan bias, and in accordance with legal public expectation, and with

the steady practice of the departments, throughout our history, and had been in no part based on assumed historical facts which are not really true; or, if wanting in some of these, it had been before the court more than once, and had there been affirmed and re-affirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent.

But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country. But Judge Douglas considers this view awful. Hear him:

"The courts are the tribunals prescribed by the Constitution and created by the authority of the people to determine, expound and enforce the law. Hence, whoever resists the final decision of the highest judicial tribunal, aims a deadly blow to our whole Republican system of government—a blow which, if successful, would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy and violence. I repeat, therefore, that if resistance to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a matter like the points decided in the Dred Scott case, clearly within their jurisdiction as defined by the Constitution, shall be forced upon the country as a political issue, it will become a distinct and naked issue between the friends and enemies of the Constitution—the friends and the enemies of the supremacy of the laws."

Why, this same Supreme Court once decided a national bank to be Constitutional; but General Jackson, as President of the United States, disregarded the decision, and vetoed a bill for a re-charter, partly on Constitutional ground, declaring that each public functionary must support the Constitution, "as he understands it." But hear the General's own words. Here they are, taken from his veto message:

"It is maintained by the advocates of the bank, that its Constitutionality, in all its features, ought to be considered as settled by precedent, and by the decision of the Supreme Court. To this conclusion I can not assent. Mere precedent is a dangerous source of authority, and should not be regarded as deciding questions of Constitutional power, except where the acquiescence of the people and the States can be considered as well settled. So far from this being the case on this subject, an argument against the bank might be based on precedent. One Congress, in 1791, decided in favor of a bank; another, in 1811, decided against it. One Congress, in 1815, decided against a bank; another, in 1816, decided in its favor. Prior to the present Congress, therefore, the prece-

dents drawn from that source were equal. If we resort to the States, the expressions of legislative, judicial and executive opinions against the bank have been probably to those in its favor as four to one. There is nothing in precedent, therefore, which, if its authority were admitted, ought to weigh in favor of the act before me."

I drop the quotations merely to remark, that all there ever was, in the way of precedent up to the Dred Scott decision, on the points therein decided, had been against that decision. But hear General Jackson further :

"If the opinion of the Supreme Court covered the whole ground of this act, it ought not to control the co-ordinate authorities of this Government. The Congress, the Executive and the Court, must each for itself be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public officer, who takes an oath to support the Constitution, swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others."

Again and again have I heard Judge Douglas denounce that bank decision, and applaud General Jackson for disregarding it. It would be interesting for him to look over his recent speech, and see how exactly his fierce philippics against us for resisting Supreme Court decisions, fall upon his own head. It will call to mind a long and fierce political war in this country, upon an issue which, in his own language, and, of course, in his own changeless estimation, was "a distinct issue between the friends and the enemies of the Constitution," and in which war he fought in the ranks of the enemies of the Constitution.

I have said, in substance, that the Dred Scott decision was, in part, based on assumed historical facts which were not really true, and I ought not to leave the subject without giving some reasons for saying this; I, therefore, give an instance or two, which I think fully sustain me. Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the majority of the Court, insists at great length, that negroes were no part of the people who made, or for whom was made, the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution of the United States.

On the contrary, Judge Curtis, in his dissenting opinion, shows that in five of the then thirteen States, to wit: New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and North Carolina, free negroes were voters, and, in proportion to their numbers, had the same part in making the Constitution that the white people had. He shows this with so much particularity as to leave no doubt of its truth; and as a sort of conclusion on that point, holds the following language:

"The Constitution was ordained and established by the

people of the United States, through the action, in each State, of those persons who were qualified by its laws to act thereon in behalf of themselves and all other citizens of the State. In some of the States, as we have seen, colored persons were among those qualified by law to act on the subject. These colored persons were not only included in the body of 'the people of the United States,' by whom the Constitution was ordained and established; but in at least five of the States they had the power to act, and, doubtless, did act, by their suffrages, upon the question of its adoption."

Again, Chief Justice Tancy says: "It is difficult, at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted." And again, after quoting from the Declaration, he says: "The general words above quoted would seem to include the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood."

In these the Chief Justice does not directly assert, but plainly assumes, as a fact, that the public estimate of the black man is more favorable now than it was in the days of the Revolution. This assumption is a mistake. In some trifling particulars, the condition of that race has been ameliorated; but, as a whole, in this country, the change between then and now is decidedly the other way; and their ultimate destiny has never appeared so hopeless as in the last three or four years. In two of the five States—New Jersey and North Carolina—that then gave the free negro the right of voting, the right has since been taken away; and in the third—New York—it has been greatly abridged; while it has not been extended, so far as I know, to a single additional State, though the number of the States has more than doubled. In those days, as I understand, masters could, at their own pleasure, emancipate their slaves; but since then such legal restraints have been made upon emancipation as to amount almost to prohibition. In those days "Legislatures held the unquestioned power to abolish slavery in their respective States; but now it is becoming quite fashionable for State Constitutions to withhold that power from the Legislatures. In those days, by common consent, the spread of the black man's bondage to the new countries was prohibited; but now, Congress decides that it will not continue the prohibition—and the Supreme Court decides that it could not if it would. In those days our Declaration of Independence was held

sacred by all, and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed, sneered at, construed, hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him; ambition follows, philosophy follows, and the theology of the day is fast joining the cry. They have him in his prison-house; they have searched his person, and left no prying instrument with him. One after another they have closed the heavy iron doors upon him; and now they have him, as it were, bolted in with a lock of a hundred keys, which can never be unlocked without the concurrence of every key; the keys in the hands of a hundred different men, and they scattered to a hundred different and distant places; and they stand musing as to what invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter, can be produced to make the impossibility of his escape more complete than it is.

It is grossly incorrect to say or assume, that the public estimate of the negro is more favorable now than it was at the origin of the Government.

Three years and a half ago Judge Douglas brought forward his famous Nebraska bill. The country was at once in a blaze. He scorned all opposition, and carried it through Congress. Since then he has seen himself superseded in a Presidential nomination, by one indorsing the general doctrine of his measure, but at the same time standing clear of the odium of its untimely agitation, and its gross breach of national faith; and he has seen that successful rival Constitutionally elected, not by the strength of friends, but by the division of his adversaries, being in a popular minority of nearly four hundred thousand votes. He has seen his chief aids in his own State, Shields and Richardson, politically speaking, successively tried, convicted, and executed, for an offense not their own, but his. And now he sees his own case, standing next on the docket for trial.

There is a natural disgust, in the minds of nearly all white people, to the idea of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races; and Judge Douglas evidently is basing his chief hope upon the chances of his being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He, therefore, clings to this hope, as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the opposition to the Dred Scott decision. He finds the

Republicans insisting that the Declaration of Independence includes ALL men, black as well as white, and forthwith he boldly denies that it includes negroes at all, and proceeds to argue gravely that all who contend it does, do so only because they want to vote, eat and sleep, and marry with negroes! He will have it that they can not be consistent else. Now, I protest against the counterfeit logic which concludes that, because I do not want a black woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. I need not have her for either. I can just leave her alone. In some respects she certainly is not my equal; but in her natural right to eat the bread she earns with her own hands, without asking leave of any one else, she is my equal, and the equal of all others.

Chief Justice Taney, in his opinion in the Dred Scott case, admits that the language of the Declaration is broad enough to include the whole human family; but he and Judge Douglas argue that the authors of that instrument did not intend to include negroes, by the fact that they did not at once actually place them on an equality with the whites. Now, this grave argument comes to just nothing at all, by the other fact, that they did not at once, or ever afterward, actually place all white people on an equality with one another. And this is the staple argument of both the Chief Justice and the Senator for doing this obvious violence to the plain, unmistakable language of the Declaration.

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include *all* men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal *in all respects*. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with “certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” This they said, and this meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet, that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the *right*, so that the *enforcement* of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

Mr. Lincoln, in conclusion, pointed out in a clear and forcible manner the real distinction between his own views and those of Mr. Douglas, on this question, as he has done in other speeches.

CHAPTER XI.

THE LINCOLN-DOUGLAS CAMPAIGN OF 1858.

The Lecompton Struggle.—The Policy of Douglas Changed.—He Breaks with the Administration and Loses Caste at the South.—Republican Sympathies.—Douglas Falters, but Opposes the English Bill.—Passage of that Measure.—Democratic State Convention of Illinois.—Douglas Indorsed, and Efforts for His Re-election Commenced.—The Democratic Bolt.—Meeting of the Republican State Convention in June.—Mr. Lincoln named as the First and Only Choice of the Republicans for Senator.—His Great Speech Before the Convention at Springfield.—Douglas and Lincoln at Chicago.—Speeches at Bloomington and Springfield.—Unfairness of the Apportionment Pointed Out by Mr. Lincoln.—He Analyzes the Douglas Programme.—Seven Joint Debates.—Douglas Produces a Bogus Platform, and Propounds Interrogatories.—“Unfriendly Legislation.”—Lincoln Fully Defines His Position on the Slavery Question.—Result of the Canvass.—The People for Lincoln; the Apportionment for Douglas.—Public opinion.

The Lecompton Convention did its work according to the programme laid down at Washington. It adopted the Constitution desired, and probably devised, at the national capital, with the design of forcing slavery upon an unwilling people. One of the chief instruments in the execution of this work, so far as it could be consummated at Lecompton, was John Calhoun, an Illinois politician. The act under which that Convention was assembled, had received an unreserved and complete indorsement from Douglas, as “fair and just.” He was emphatically committed in advance by his Springfield speech to the action of that Convention, which exercised no powers not distinctly conferred upon it by the act thus indorsed, or not in strict accordance with what was contemplated from the first by its framers. Yet late in the autumn of 1857, a rumor began to be circulated that Douglas was hesitating about sustaining the Lecompton Constitution. Know

ing his previous attitude, people were generally incredulous in regard to this report. After a time, however, some of the leading Democratic papers of Illinois began to break ground against the Lecompton scheme, and when Congress assembled, in December, there were serious doubts as to whether Douglas did not intend to break with the Administration on this subject. Suspense on this point was soon relieved. Immediately after the annual message of Mr. Buchanan was read in the Senate, Douglas took occasion to announce his disagreement with the President on the Kansas question, and this notice was followed up by an elaborate speech the next day, in which he boldly talked against "forcing this Constitution down the throats of the people of Kansas in opposition to their wishes and in violation of our pledges." He ignored all his recent attempts to charge the responsibility upon the non-voters if the Constitution did not suit them. He seemed to forget his declaration that the act calling the Lecompton Convention was "just and fair in all its objects and provisions." He now denied the right of the minority represented at Lecompton, in accordance with the well-understood "objects and provisions" of that act, "to defraud the majority of that people out of their elective franchise."

In brief, whatever his motives — and these may be left to himself — he had completely changed his attitude during the last few months, and now co-operated with the Republicans in opposing the Lecompton policy to which the President and the Democratic party had become definitely committed before the world. These two facts, however, are undeniable. The re-election of Douglas as Senator was to depend on the coming election in Illinois, and without some definite change of course, from that he had indicated at Springfield in June previous, he would be compelled to yield his place to Abraham Lincoln, as the associate of Lyman Trumbull.

It is not necessary here to follow the history of the desperate struggle which this change cost him during the long session of Congress. He carried with him but two Democratic Senators out of nearly forty, and only a little larger fraction of the Democratic members of the House. He was generally

denounced at the South as a traitor, and this fact, added to the energy with which he carried on his warfare with the Administration against so many odds, gained him not a little sympathy in many Republican quarters. This, however, for the most part, his subsequent course alienated. It is believed that but for the firm stand taken by the lamented Broderick, in opposition to the course intended, Douglas would have made his peace with the Administration by voting for the shabby compromise known as the English Bill. That measure, in spite of his final influence against it, passed both Houses on the 4th of May.

Previous to that date, the Democratic State Convention, of Illinois, had met at Springfield (April 21st), nominated a State ticket and indorsed Douglas and his Anti-Lecompton associates from that State. The issue was thus fairly joined early in the season; and all the influence of the Administration was brought to bear in getting up a counter Democratic organization sustaining the Lecompton policy. However promising for a time, this undertaking was not brilliantly successful. The friends of Douglas had taken time by the forelock, and made the most of their advantage in having the regular organization, with a State ticket early in the field. They spared no labor from this time forward in preparing for the re-election of Douglas. Without expecting the election of their candidates on the State ticket, they hoped, through an unequal apportionment strongly favoring their side, and from the large number of Democratic Senators holding over, to be able, at least, to get the control of the Senate, and to prevent the choice of a Republican successor to Douglas, if they could not accomplish their full purpose.

On the 16th of June—the day on which the session of Congress closed—the Republicans held their State Convention at Springfield. Richard Yates was the temporary, and Gustavus Koerner the permanent President. Nearly every one of the hundred counties of Illinois was duly represented, the delegates numbering over five hundred. Candidates were nominated for State Treasurer and for Superintendent of Public Instruction, and a Platform was adopted essentially the same as that put

forth two years previously at Bloomington, as already quoted. A resolution approving the course of Lyman Trumbull as Senator was carried without opposition. The following resolution was then introduced, which, according to the official report, "was greeted with shouts of applause, and unanimously adopted:"

Resolved, That Abraham Lincoln is the first and only choice of the Republicans of Illinois for the United States Senate, as the successor of Stephen A. Douglas.

Mr. Lincoln had not been present during the Convention, and when called on to speak, at the adjourned evening session, he had no knowledge that such a resolution had been offered. So far was it from being true that his speech on that occasion, as subsequently stated by Douglas, was made on accepting a nomination for the Senatorship, that, of course, he did not allude to that subject. The speech, too, though carefully prepared, as Mr. Lincoln afterward admitted, was never known to any one else than himself until its delivery, notwithstanding the insinuation of Douglas that it was a subject of special consultation among the Republican leaders. It was the result of a broad and profound survey of the slavery question, from the point of view then reached in the progress of parties. It laid down certain propositions as philosophical truths, derived from a close observation of events. Its opening paragraph has already become one of the most celebrated passages in the political literature of the country. However it may be perverted, there is no portion of this speech which can be successfully assailed, when taken in its true meaning. There is a moral sublimity in the rugged honesty and directness with which the grand issues, in this whole slavery agitation are presented. The two forces of slavery and free labor in our civil and social system, inevitably antagonistic, *so long as they come into collision in our national politics*, have each their peculiar tendency, the one to make slavery, and the other to make free labor universal. Until slavery is again reduced to its true local and sectional character, from which Douglas, Buchanan, and other agitators have conspired to raise it into national predominance, the antagonism will not cease. What Douglas has

always superficially slurred over—pretending an *indifference*, such as no earnest or sound statesman can really feel, whether “slavery is voted up or voted down”—Lincoln treats with true philosophic insight, and in the light of earnest convictions. This famous speech is in entire harmony with the views of the earlier statesmen, even of the South. If any man at first reads this great effort doubtingly, or with an inclination toward dissent—as most assuredly few really earnest, thinking men can—let him carefully look onward and see how it endures the test of a severe campaign, and how its chief positions are maintained against all the assaults of a wily foe, who is himself really on trial, solemnly indicted by that speech, yet vainly imagines that he is placing Mr. Lincoln on the defensive.

“The hall, and lobbies, and galleries were even more densely crowded and packed than at any time during the day,” says the official report, as the Convention reassembled in the evening to hear Mr. Lincoln. “As he approached the speaker’s stand, he was greeted with shouts, and hurrahs, and prolonged cheering.”

MR. LINCOLN’S FIRST SPEECH IN THE SENATORIAL CANVASS.

(*At the Republican State Convention, June 16, 1858.*)

Mr. Lincoln said—

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION:—If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far on into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed. —“A house divided against itself can not stand.” I believe this Government can not endure, permanently, half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall

become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition? Let any one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery, so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted, but also let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, among its chief master-workers from the beginning.

But, so far, Congress only had acted; and an indorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable, to save the point already gained, and give chance for more. The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State Constitutions, and from most of the national territory by Congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle, which ended in repealing that Congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "*squatter sovereignty*," otherwise called "*sacred right of self-government*," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: that if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "*squatter sovereignty*," and "*sacred right of self-government*."

"But," said opposition members, "let us be more specific—let us *amend* the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory *may* exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska Bill was passing through Congress, a law case, involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free State and then a territory covered by the Congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave—for a long time in each—

was passing through the U. S. Circuit Court for the District of Missouri; and both the Nebraska Bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's name was "Dred Scott," which name now designates the decision finally made in the case.

Before the then next Presidential election case, the law came to, and was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until *after* the election. Still, *before* the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requests the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state *his opinion* whether a people of a territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers, "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the *indorsement*, such as it was, secured. That was the *second* point gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement.

The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a re-argument. The Presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming President, in his Inaugural Address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, *whatever it might be*. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

This was the third point gained.

The reputed author of the Nebraska Bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capitol indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to indorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained. At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska Bill on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and, in that squabble, the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind—the principle for which he declares he has suffered much, and is ready to suffer to the end.

And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision, "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding—like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast, and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point—the right of a people to make their own Constitution—upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery in its present state of advancement. The working points of that machinery are:

First, That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such, can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States.

This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of this provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that—"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Secondly, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States Territory.

This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the Territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, that whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master.

This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election, then, to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it,

the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up.

This shows exactly where we now are, and partially also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision afterward to come in, and declare that perfect freedom of the people, to be just no freedom at all.

Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people to exclude slavery, voted down? Plainly enough now, the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision.

Why was the court decision held up? Why even a Senator's individual opinion withheld till after the Presidential election? Plainly enough now; the speaking out then would have damaged the "*perfectly free*" argument upon which the election was to be carried.

Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of a re-argument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-indorsements of the decision, by the President and others?

We can not absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of pre-concert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out, at different times and places, and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska Bill, the people of a State as well as Territory, were to be left "*perfectly free*," "*subject only to the Constitution*." Why mention a State? They were legislating for Territories, and not for or about States. Certainly the people of a State are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this lugged into this merely territorial law? Why are the people of a Territory and the people of a State therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same?

While the opinion of the court, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery from any United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State, or the people of a State to exclude it. *Possibly*, this was a mere *omission*; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a State to exclude slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a Territory, into the Nebraska Bill—I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down, in the one case, as it had been in the other.

The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over slavery, is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language, too, of the Nebraska Act. On one occasion his exact language is, "except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction."

In what cases the power of the State is so restrained by the United States Constitution, is left an open question, precisely as the same question, as to the restraint on the power of the Territories was left open in the Nebraska Act. Put that and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up," shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the

power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their State free; and we shall awake to the reality, instead, that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave State.

To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty, is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. That is what we have to do. But how can we best do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper softly, that Senator Douglas is the *aptest* instrument there is, with which to effect that object. They do not tell us, nor has he told us, that he wishes any such object to be effected. They wish us to infer all, from the facts that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us, on a single point, upon which he and we have never differed.

They remind us that *he* is a very *great man*, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "*a living dog is better than a dead lion.*" Judge Douglas, if not a *dead lion* for this work, is at least a *caged* and *toothless* one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He don't care anything about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it.

A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave-trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he *really* think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a *sacred right* of white men to take negro slaves into the new Territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And, unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia.

He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave-trade—how can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free"—unless he does it as a *protection* to the home production? And as the home *producers* will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday—that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But, can we for that reason run ahead and infer that he will make any particular change, of which he himself has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inferences?

Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, *if ever*, he and we can come together on *principle*, so that our great cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle.

But clearly, he is not now with us—he does not pretend to be—he does not promise ever to be. Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by its own undoubted friends—those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work—who do care for the result.

Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy. Did we brave all then to falter now?—*now*—when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered and belligerent?

The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail—if we stand firm, we shall not fail. *Wise counsels* may *accelerate* or *mistakes delay* it, but, sooner or later, the victory is *sure* to come.

Mr. Douglas, having lingered for more than three weeks on his way homeward, preparing for the struggle before him, arrived in Chicago on the 9th of July, amid the most showy demonstrations of his friends. He made a long speech on the occasion, which Mr. Lincoln was present to hear. Douglas claimed great credit as having defeated the President's Lecompton policy, and imperiously returned thanks to the Republicans for “coming up manfully and sustaining” him and his little band in opposition to the Administration—a course, certainly, for which the Republican party deserved no special thanks, as it required of them no sacrifice of either consistency or partizan fellowship. Subsequently he charged an alliance between the Republicans and the Administration party for his defeat. He took care again to avow an utter indifference as to whether Kansas should be slave soil or free soil, only asking that the popular majority should prevail. At length he came to the great opening speech of Mr. Lincoln, which had been carefully pondered during the last three weeks.

"I have observed," he said with condescending assurance, "I have observed from the public prints, that but a few days ago the Republican party of the State of Illinois assembled in convention at Springfield, and not only laid down their platform, but nominated a candidate for the United States Senate as my successor. I take great pleasure in saying that I have known, personally and intimately, for about a quarter of a century, the worthy gentleman who has been nominated *for my place*; and I will say that I regard him as a kind, amiable and intelligent gentleman, a good citizen, and an honorable opponent; and whatever issue I may have with him will be of principle, and not involving personalities." He then proceeded to specify his two chief points of attack on Mr. Lincoln, after citing a portion of the first paragraph of his Springfield speech. Mr. Douglas endeavored thus to put his opponent in a false position, by selecting sentences out of their connection, and imputing to them a perverted meaning. His first point he thus states:

In other words, Mr. Lincoln asserts as a fundamental principle of this Government, that there must be uniformity in the local laws and domestic institutions of each and all the States of the Union, and he therefore invites all the non-slaveholding States to band together, organize as one body, and make war upon slavery in Kentucky, upon slavery in Virginia, upon slavery in the Carolinas, upon slavery in all of the slaveholding States in this Union, and to persevere in that war until it shall be exterminated. He then notifies the slaveholding States to stand together as a unit and make an aggressive war upon the free States of this Union, with a view of establishing slavery in them all; of forcing it upon Illinois, of forcing it upon New York, upon New England, and upon every other free State, and that they shall keep up the warfare until it has been formally established in them all. In other words, Mr. Lincoln advocates boldly and clearly a war of sections, a war of the North against the South, of the free States against the slave States—a war of extermination—to be continued relentlessly until the one or the other should be subdued, and all the States shall either become free or become slave.

His other point was made in these words:

The other proposition discussed by Mr. Lincoln in his

speech, consists in a crusade against the Supreme Court of the United States on account of the Dred Scott decision. On this question, also, I desire to say to you, unequivocally, that I take direct and distinct issue with him. I have no warfare to make on the Supreme Court of the United States, either on account of that or any other decision which they have pronounced from that bench. The Constitution of the United States has provided that the powers of Government (and the Constitution of each State has the same provision) shall be divided into three departments—executive, legislative, and judicial. The right and the province of expounding the Constitution, and constructing the law, is vested in the judiciary established by the Constitution. As a lawyer, I feel at liberty to appear before the court and controvert any principle of law while the question is pending before the tribunal; but when the decision is made, my private opinion, your opinion, all other opinions, must yield to the majesty of that authoritative adjudication.

Later in the same speech. Mr. Douglas said on this head:

On the other point, Mr. Lincoln goes for a warfare upon the Supreme Court of the United States, because of their decision in the Dred Scott case. I yield obedience to the decisions of that court—to the final determination of the highest judicial tribunal known to our Constitution. He objects to the Dred Scott decision because it does not put the negro in the possession of the rights of citizenship on an equality with the white man. I am opposed to negro equality. I repeat that this nation is a white people—a people composed of European descendants—a people that have established this Government for themselves and their posterity, and I am in favor of preserving not only the purity of the blood, but the purity of the Government, from any mixture or amalgamation with inferior races. I have seen the effects of this mixture of superior and inferior races—this amalgamation of white men and Indians and negroes; we have seen it in Mexico, in Central America, in South America, and in all the Spanish-American States, and its result has been degeneration, demoralization, and degradation below the capacity for self-government.

How completely, yet artfully, the positions of Mr. Lincoln were misrepresented in these extracts, will partly appear from reading his speech made at Springfield on the 26th of June, 1857. These perversions were completely disposed of in Mr. Lincoln's reply, at Chicago, on the following evening, July

10th. An intense eagerness to hear his answer drew together a great crowd, and the reception of Mr. Lincoln, on his appearance, was most enthusiastic, the applause continuing for several minutes.

MR. LINCOLN'S REPLY TO DOUGLAS.

(At Chicago, on the evening of July 10, 1858.)

Mr. Lincoln said :

MY FELLOW-CITIZENS: On yesterday evening, upon the occasion of the reception given to Senator Douglas, I was furnished with a seat very convenient for hearing him, and was otherwise very courteously treated by him and his friends, for which I thank him and them. During the course of his remarks my name was mentioned in such a way as, I suppose, renders it at least not improper that I should make some sort of reply to him. I shall not attempt to follow him in the precise order in which he addressed the assembled multitude upon that occasion, though I shall perhaps do so in the main.

THE ALLEGED ALLIANCE.

There was one question to which he asked the attention of the crowd, which I deem of somewhat less importance—at least of propriety for me to dwell upon—than the others, which he brought in near the close of his speech, and which I think it would not be entirely proper for me to omit attending to, and yet if I were not to give some attention to it now, I should probably forget it altogether. While I am upon this subject, allow me to say that I do not intend to indulge in that inconvenient mode sometimes adopted in public speaking, of reading from documents; but I shall depart from that rule so far as to read a little scrap from his speech, which notices this first topic of which I shall speak—that is, provided I can find it in the paper. [Examines the morning's paper.]

“I have made up my mind to appeal to the people against the combination that has been made against me! the Republican leaders having formed an alliance, an unholy and unnatural alliance, with a portion of unscrupulous federal office-holders. I intend to fight that allied army wherever I meet them. I know they deny the alliance, but yet these men who are trying to divide the Democratic party for the purpose of electing a Republican Senator in my place, are just as much the agents and tools of the supporters of Mr. Lincoln. Hence I shall deal with this allied army just as the Russians dealt with the allies at Sebastopol—that is, the Russians did

not stop to inquire, when they fired a broadside, whether it hit an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a Turk. Nor will I stop to inquire, nor shall I hesitate, whether my blows shall hit these Republican leaders or their allies, who are holding the federal offices and yet acting in concert with them."

Well, now, gentlemen, is not that very alarming? Just to think of it! right at the outset of his canvass, I, a poor, kind, amiable, intelligent gentleman, I am to be slain in this way. Why, my friends, the Judge, is not only, as it turns out, not a dead lion, nor even a living one—he is the rugged Russian Bear! [Laughter and applause.]

But if they will have it—for he says that we deny it—that there is any such alliance, as he says there is—and I don't propose hanging very much upon this question of veracity—but if he will have it that there is such an alliance—that the Administration men and we are allied, and we stand in the attitude of English, French and Turk, he occupying the position of the Russian, in that case, I beg that he will indulge us while we barely suggest to him that these allies took Sebastopol. [Great applause.]

Gentlemen, only a few more words as to this alliance. For my part, I have to say, that whether there be such an alliance, depends, so far as I know, upon what may be a right definition of the term *alliance*. If for the Republican party to see the other great party to which they are opposed divided among themselves, and not try to stop the division and rather be glad of it—if that is an alliance, I confess I am in; but if it is meant to be said that the Republicans had formed an alliance going beyond that, by which there is contribution of money or sacrifice of principle on the one side or the other, so far as the Republican party is concerned, if there be any such thing, I protest that I neither know any thing of it, nor do I believe it. I will, however, say—as I think this branch of the argument is lugged in—I would before I leave it, state, for the benefit of those concerned, that one of those same Buchanan men did once tell me of an argument that he made for his opposition to Judge Douglas. He said that a friend of our Senator Douglas had been talking to him, and had among other things said to him: "Why, you don't want to beat Douglas?" "Yes," said he, "I do want to beat him, and I will tell you why. I believe his original Nebraska Bill was right in the abstract, but it was wrong in the time that it was brought forward. It was wrong in the application to a Territory in regard to which the question had been settled; it was brought forward at a time when nobody asked him; it was tendered to the South when the South had not asked for it,

but when they could not well refuse it; and for this same reason he forced that question upon our party; it has sunk the best men all over the nation, everywhere; and now when our President, struggling with the difficulties of this man's getting up, has reached the very hardest point to turn in the case, he deserts him, and I *am* for putting him where he will trouble us no more."

Now, gentlemen, that is not my argument—that is not my argument at all. I have only been stating to you the argument of a Buchanan man. You will judge if there is any force in it.

WHAT IS POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

Popular sovereignty! everlasting popular sovereignty! Let us for a moment inquire into this vast matter of popular sovereignty. What is popular sovereignty? We recollect that in an early period in the history of this struggle, there was another name for the same thing—*Squatter Sovereignty*. It was not exactly Popular Sovereignty, but Squatter Sovereignty. What do those terms mean? What do those terms mean when used now? And vast credit is taken by our friend, the Judge, in regard to his support of it, when he declares the last years of his life have been, and all the future years of his life shall be, devoted to this matter of popular sovereignty. What is it? Why, it is the sovereignty of the people! What was Squatter Sovereignty? I suppose if it had any significance at all it was the right of the people to govern themselves, to be sovereign in their own affairs while they were squatted down in a country not their own, while they had squatted on a Territory that did not belong to them, in the sense that a State belongs to the people who inhabit it—when it belonged to the nation—such right to govern themselves was called "*Squatter Sovereignty*."

Now I wish you to mark. What has become of that Squatter Sovereignty? What has become of it? Can you get anybody to tell you now that the people of a Territory have any authority to govern themselves, in regard to this mooted question of slavery, before they form a State Constitution? No such thing at all, although there is a general running fire, and although there has been a hurrah made in every speech on that side, assuming that policy had given the people of a Territory the right to govern themselves upon this question; yet the point is dodged. To-day it has been decided—no more than a year ago it was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and is insisted upon to-day, that the people

of a Territory have no right to exclude slavery from a Territory, that if any one man chooses to take slaves into a Territory, all the rest of the people have no right to keep them out. This being so, and this decision being made one of the points that the Judge approved, and one in the approval of which he says he means to keep me down—*put me down* I should not say, for I have never been up. He says he is in favor of it, and sticks to it, and expects to win his battle on that decision, which says that there is no such thing as Squatter Sovereignty; but that any one man may take slaves into a Territory, and all the other men in the Territory may be opposed to it, and yet by reason of the Constitution they can not prohibit it. When that is so, how much is left of this vast matter of Squatter Sovereignty I should like to know? [A voice—"It is all gone."]

When we get back, we get to the point of the right of the people to make a Constitution. Kansas was settled, for example, in 1854. It was a Territory yet, without having formed a Constitution, in a very regular way, for three years. All this time negro slavery could be taken in by any few individuals, and by that decision of the Supreme Court, which the Judge approves, all the rest of the people can not keep it out; but when they come to make a Constitution they may say they will not have slavery. But it is there; they are obliged to tolerate it some way, and all experience shows it will be so—for they will not take negro slaves and absolutely deprive the owners of them. All experience shows this to be so. All that space of time that runs from the beginning of the settlement of the Territory until there is sufficiency of people to make a State Constitution—all that portion of time popular sovereignty is given up. The seal is absolutely put down upon it by the Court decision, and Judge Douglas puts his on the top of that, yet he is appealing to the people to give him vast credit for his devotion to popular sovereignty. [Applause.]

Again, when we get to the question of the right of the people to form a State Constitution as they please, to form it with slavery or without slavery—if that is any thing new, I confess I don't know it. Has there ever been a time when any body said that any other than the people of a Territory itself should form a Constitution? What is now in it that Judge Douglas should have fought several years of his life, and pledge himself to fight all the remaining years of his life for? Can Judge Douglas find any body on earth that said that any body else should form a Constitution for a

people? [A voice, "Yes."] Well, I should like you to name him; I should like to know who he was. [Same voice, "John Calhoun."]

Mr. Lincoln—No, Sir, I never heard of even John Calhoun saying such a thing. He insisted on the same principle as Judge Douglas; but his mode of applying it in fact, was wrong. It is enough for my purpose to ask this crowd, when ever a Republican said anything against it? They never said anything against it, but they have constantly spoken for it; and whosoever will undertake to examine the platform, and the speeches of responsible men of the party, and of irresponsible men, too, if you please, will be unable to find one word from anybody in the Republican ranks, opposed to that Popular Sovereignty which Judge Douglas thinks that he has invented. [Applause.] I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. [Loud applause.] Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it?

[After referring, in appropriate terms, to the credit claimed by Douglas for defeating the Lecompton policy, Mr. Lincoln proceeds]:

I defy you to show a printed resolution passed in a Democratic meeting—I take it upon myself to defy any man to show a printed resolution of a Democratic meeting, large or small, in favor of Judge Trumbull, or any of the five to one Republicans who beat that bill. Every thing must be for the Democrats! They did every thing, and the five to the one that really did the thing, they snub over, and they do not seem to remember that they have an existence upon the face of the earth.

LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS—THE PERVERTED ISSUES.

Gentlemen, I fear that I shall become tedious. I leave this branch of the subject to take hold of another. I take up that part of Judge Douglas's speech in which he respectfully attended to me.

Judge Douglas made two points upon my recent speech at Springfield. He says they are to be the issues of this campaign. The first one of these points he bases upon the language in a speech which I delivered at Springfield, which I believe I can quote correctly from memory. I said there that "we are now far on in the fifth year since a policy was instituted for the avowed object, and with the confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation; under the operation of that policy, that agitation had not only not ceased, but had constantly augmented. I believe it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself can not stand. I believe this Government can not endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved"—I am quoting from my speech—"I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will come all one thing or the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall have become alike lawful in all the States, North as well as South."

In this paragraph which I have quoted in your hearing, and to which I ask the attention of all, Judge Douglas thinks he discovers great political heresy. I want your attention particularly to what he has inferred from it. He says I am in favor of making all the States of this Union uniform in all their internal regulations; that in all their domestic concerns I am in favor of making them entirely uniform. He draws this inference from the language I have quoted to you. He says that I am in favor of making war by the North upon the South for the extinction of slavery; that I am also in favor of inviting, as he expresses it, the South to a war upon the North, for the purpose of nationalizing slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I did not say that I was in favor of any thing in it. I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only—it may have been a foolish one perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I do say so now, however, so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the next speech.

Gentlemen, Judge Douglas informed you that this speech of mine was probably carefully prepared. I admit that it was. I am not master of language; I have not a fine education; I am not capable of entering into a disquisition upon dialectics, as I believe you call it; but I do not believe the language I

employed bears any such construction as Judge Douglas puts upon it. But I don't care about a quibble in regard to words. I know what I meant, and I will not leave this crowd in doubt, if I can explain it to them, what I really meant in the use of that paragraph.

I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Government has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I know that. I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of the country, and I know that it has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I *believe*—and that is what I meant to allude to there—I *believe* it has endured, because during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska bill, the public mind did rest all the time in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. That was what gave us the rest that we had through that period of eighty-two years; at least, so I believe. I have always hated slavery, I think, as much as any Abolitionist. I have been an Old Line Whig. I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska Bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. [Pointing to Mr. Browning, who stood near by:] Browning thought so; the great mass of the nation have rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. They had reason so to believe.

The adoption of the Constitution and its attendant history led the people to believe so; and that such was the belief of the framers of the Constitution itself. Why did those old men, about the time of the adoption of the Constitution, decree that slavery should not go into the new territory, where it had not already gone? Why declare that within twenty years the African slave-trade, by which slaves are supplied, might be cut off by Congress? Why were all these acts? I might enumerate more of such acts—but enough. What were they but a clear indication that the framers of the Constitution intended and expected the ultimate extinction of that institution? [Cheers.] And now, when I say, as I said in this speech that Judge Douglas has quoted from, when I say that I think the opponents of slavery will resist the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest with the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, I only mean to say, that they will place it where the founders of this Government originally placed it.

I have said a hundred times, and I have no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right, and ought to be no inclination in the people of the free States to enter into

the slave States, and to interfere with the question of slavery at all. I have said that always. Judge Douglas has heard me say it—if not quite a hundred times, at least as good as a hundred times; and when it is said that I am in favor of interfering with slavery where it exists, I know that it is unwarranted by anything I have ever intended, and, as I believe, by anything I have ever said. If, by any means, I have ever used language which could fairly be so construed (as, however, I believe I never have), I now correct it.

So much, then, for the inference that Judge Douglas draws, that I am in favor of setting the sections at war with one another. I know that I never meant any such thing, and I believe that no fair mind can infer any such thing from anything I have ever said.

Now in relation to his inference that I am in favor of a general consolidation of all the local institutions of the various States. I will attend to that for a little while, and try to inquire, if I can, how on earth it could be that any man could draw such an inference from any thing I said. I have said, very many times, in Judge Douglas's hearing, that no man believed more than I in the principle of self-government; that it lies at the bottom of all my ideas of just government, from beginning to end. I have denied that his use of that term applies properly. But for the thing itself, I deny that any man has ever gone ahead of me in his devotion to the principle, whatever he may have done in efficiency in advocating it. I think that I have said it in your hearing—that I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and with the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights—[applause] that each community, as a State, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns within that State that interfere with the right of no other State, and that the General Government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with any thing other than that general class of things that does concern the whole. I have said that at all times. I have said as illustrations, that I do not believe in the right of Illinois to interfere with the cranberry laws of Indiana, the oyster laws of Virginia, or the liquor laws of Maine. I have said these things over and over again, and I repeat them here as my sentiments. * * * * *

So much then as to my disposition—my wish—to have all the State Legislatures blotted out, and to have one consolidated government, and a uniformity of domestic regulations in all the States; by which I suppose it is meant, if we raise corn here, we must make sugar-cane grow here too, and we must

make those which grow North grow in the South. All this I suppose he understands I am in favor of doing. Now, so much for all this nonsense—for I must call it so. The Judge can have no issue with me on a question of established uniformity in the domestic regulations of the States.

DRED SCOTT DECISION.

A little now on the other point—the Dred Scott decision. Another of the issues he says that is to be made with me, is upon his devotion to the Dred Scott decision, and my opposition to it.

I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat my opposition to the Dred Scott decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition, and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used, “resistance to the decision?” I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that, but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should.

That is what I would do. Judge Douglas said last night, that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made; but *after* it was made he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so! We let this property abide by the decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. [Loud applause.] We will try to put it where Judge Douglas will not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it was made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably.

What are the uses of decisions of courts? They have two uses. As rules of property they have two uses. First—they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave. Nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to every body else, that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands, is as he is. That is, they say that when a question comes up upon another person, it will be so decided again unless the court decides in another way, unless the court overrules its decision. [Renewed applause.] Well, we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way. That is one thing we mean to try to do.

The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision, is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an *astonisher* in legal history. It is a new wonder of the world. It is based upon falsehoods in the main as to the facts—allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question—the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances—thus placed, has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law. But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their vote in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it and obey it in every possible sense. Circumstances alter cases. Do not gentlemen here remember the case of that same Supreme Court, twenty-five or thirty years ago, deciding that a National Bank was Constitutional? I ask, if somebody does not remember that a National Bank was declared to be Constitutional? Such is the truth, whether it be remembered or not. The Bank charter ran out, and a re-charter was granted by Congress. That re-charter was laid before General Jackson. It was urged upon him, when he denied the Constitutionality of the Bank, that the Supreme Court had decided that it was Constitutional; and that General Jackson then said that the Supreme Court had no right to lay down a rule to govern a co-ordinate branch of the Government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution—that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it. I will venture here to say, that I have heard Judge Douglas say that he approved of General Jackson for that act. What has now become of all his tirade about “resistance to the Supreme Court?” * *

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

We were often—more than once, at least—in the course of Judge Douglas's speech last night, reminded that this Government was made for white men—that he believed it was made for white men. Well, that is putting it into a shape in which no one wants to deny it; but the Judge then goes into his passion for drawing inferences that are not warranted. I protest, now and forever, against that counterfeit logic which presumes that because I did not want a negro woman for a slave, I do

necessarily want her for a wife. My understanding is that I need not have her for either; but, as God made us separate, we can leave one another alone, and do one another much good thereby. There are white men enough to marry all the white women, and enough black men to marry all the black women, and in God's name let them be so married. The Judge regales us with the terrible enormities that take place by the mixture of races; that the inferior race bears the superior down. Why, Judge, if you do not let them get together in the Territories they won't mix there.

A voice—"Three cheers for Lincoln." (The cheers were given with a hearty good will.)

Mr. L.—I should say at least that this is a self-evident truth.

Now, it happens that we meet together once every year, some time about the Fourth of July, for some reason or other. These Fourth of July gatherings I suppose have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them.

We are now a mighty nation; we are thirty, or about thirty millions of people, and we own and inhabit about one-fifteenth part of the dry land of the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two years, and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers, vastly inferior to what we are now, with a vastly less extent of country, with vastly less of every thing we deem desirable among men—we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back, as in some way or other being connected with this rise of prosperity. We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were iron men; they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understood that by what they then did it has followed that the degree of prosperity which we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time, of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves—we feel more attached the one to the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age, and race, and country in which we live, for these celebrations. But after we have done all this, we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have, besides these—men descended by blood from our ancestors—those among us, perhaps half our people, who are not descendants at all of these men; they are men who

have come from Europe—German, Irish, French and Scandinavian—men that have come from Europe themselves, or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none; they can not carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us; but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence, they find that those old men say that “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,” and then they feel that that moral sentiment, taught on that day, evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and that they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood and flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration [loud and long-continued applause], and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world. [Applause.]

Now, sirs, for the purpose of squaring things with this idea of “don’t care if slavery is voted up or voted down,” for sustaining the Dred Scott decision, for holding that the Declaration of Independence did not mean any thing at all, we have Judge Douglas giving his exposition of what the Declaration of Independence means, and we have him saying that the people of America are equal to the people of England. According to his construction, you Germans are not connected with it. Now I ask you in all soberness, if all these things, if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and indorsed, if taught to our children and repeated to them, do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and to transform this Government into a government of some other form. These arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that Kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of King-craft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the Judge is the same old serpent that says: You work and I eat, you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it. Turn it whatever way you will—whether it come from the mouth of a King, an excuse for

enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent, and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if, taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, you begin making exceptions to it, where you will stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it! If it is not true, let us tear it out! [cries of "no, no"]; let us stick to it then; let us stand firmly by it then. [Applause.]

It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man, he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this Government. We had slaves among us; we could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery; we could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more; and having, by necessity, submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard.

My friend has said to me that I am a poor hand to quote Scripture. I will try it again, however. It is said in one of the admonitions of our Lord: "As your Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." The Saviour, I suppose, did not expect that any human creature could be perfect as the Father in Heaven; but He said: "As your Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." He set that up as a standard, and he who did most toward reaching that standard, attained the highest degree of moral perfection. So I say in relation to the principle that all men are created equal, let it be as nearly reached as we can. If we can not give freedom to every creature, let us do nothing that will impose slavery upon any other creature. [Applause.] Let us then turn this Government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it. Let us stand firmly by each other. If we do not do so we are turning in the contrary direction, that our friend Judge Douglas proposes—not intentionally—as working in the traces tends to make this one universal slave nation. He is one that runs in that direction, and as such I resist him.

My friends, I have detained you about as long as I desired to do, and I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal.

My friends, I could not, without launching off upon some new topic, which would detain you too long, continue to-night. I thank you for this most extensive audience that you have furnished me to-night. I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created free and equal.

Mr. Lincoln retired amid a perfect torrent of applause and cheers.

A week later than his Chicago speech, Mr. Douglas spoke at Bloomington, in continuation of his canvass. Here again, he laid great stress upon his "popular sovereignty" device, and upon his Anti-Lecompton rebellion. He also repeated substantially his two issues against Mr. Lincoln, based upon the Springfield speech of June 16th. Mr. Lincoln was present and heard him. The next day, Douglas made a speech of similar character at Springfield, at which Mr. Lincoln was not present. The latter, however, spoke on the same evening at that place. The following are some of the chief points of Mr. Lincoln's speech on this occasion (July 17, 1858):

INEQUALITIES OF THE CONTEST—THE APPORTIONMENT, ETC.

FELLOW CITIZENS: Another election, which is deemed an important one, is approaching, and, as I suppose, the Republican party will, without much difficulty, elect their State ticket. But in regard to the Legislature, we, the Republicans, labor under some disadvantages. In the first place, we have a Legislature to elect upon an apportionment of the representation made several years ago, when the proportion of the population was far greater in the South (as compared with the North) than it now is; and inasmuch as our opponents hold almost entire sway in the South, and we a correspondingly large majority in the North, the fact that we are now to be represented as we were years ago, when the population was different, is, to us, a very great disadvantage. We had in the year 1855, according to law, a census, or enumeration of the inhabitants, taken for

the purpose of a new apportionment of representation. We know what a fair apportionment of representation upon that census would give us. We know that it could not, if fairly made, fail to give the Republican party from six to ten more members of the Legislature than they can probably get as the law now stands. It so happened at the last session of the Legislature, that our opponents, holding the control of both branches of the Legislature, steadily refused to give us such an apportionment as we were rightly entitled to have upon the census already taken. The Legislature would pass no bill upon that subject, except such as was at least as unfair to us as the old one, and in which, in some instances, two men from the Democratic regions were allowed to go as far toward sending a member to the Legislature as three were in the Republican regions. Comparison was made at the time as to representative and senatorial districts, which completely demonstrated that such was the fact. Such a bill was passed, and tendered to the Republican Governor for his signature ; but, principally for the reasons I have stated, he withheld his approval, and the bill fell without becoming a law.

Another disadvantage under which we labor is, that there are one or two Democratic Senators who will be members of the next Legislature, and will vote for the election of Senator, who are holding over in districts in which we could, on all reasonable calculation, elect men of our own, if we only had the chance of an election. When we consider that there are but twenty-five Senators in the Senate, taking two from the side where they rightfully belong, and adding them to the other, is to us a disadvantage not to be lightly regarded. Still, so it is ; we have this to contend with. Perhaps there is no ground of complaint on our part. In attending to the many things involved in the last general election for President, Governor, Auditor, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Members of Congress and of the Legislature, County Officers, and so on, we allowed these things to happen for want of sufficient attention, and we have no cause to complain of our adversaries, so far as this matter is concerned. But we have some cause to complain of the refusal to give us a fair apportionment.

There is still another disadvantage under which we labor, and to which I will ask your attention. It arises out of the relative position of the two persons who stand before the State as candidates for the Senate. Senator Douglas is of world-wide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party, or who have been of his party for years past, have been looking upon him as certainly, at no distant day, to be the President of the

United States. They have seen in his round, jolly, fruitful face, post offices, land offices, marshalships, and cabinet appointments, chargeships and foreign missions, bursting and sprouting out in wonderful luxuriance, ready to be laid hold of by their greedy hands. [Great laughter.] And as they have been gazing upon this attractive picture so long, they can not, in the little distraction that has taken place in the party, bring themselves to give up the charming hope; but with greedier anxiety they rush about him, sustain him, and give him marches, triumphal entries, and receptions, beyond what even in the days of his highest prosperity they could have brought about in his favor. On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. [Cheering and laughter.] These are disadvantages all, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and upon principle alone. I am, in a certain sense, made the standard-bearer in behalf of the Republicans. I was made so merely because there had to be some one so placed—I being in no wise preferable to any other one of the twenty-five—perhaps a hundred we have in the Republican ranks. Then I say I wish it to be distinctly understood and borne in mind, that we have to fight this battle without many—perhaps without any—of the external aids which are brought to bear against us. So I hope those with whom I am surrounded have principle enough to nerve themselves for the task, and leave nothing undone, that can be fairly done, to bring about the right result.

THE DOUGLAS PROGRAMME.

After Senator Douglas left Washington, as his movements were made known by the public prints, he tarried a considerable time in the city of New York; and it was heralded that, like another Napoleon, he was lying by and framing the plan of his campaign. It was telegraphed to Washington city, and published in the *Union*, that he was framing his plan for the purpose of going to Illinois to pounce upon and annihilate the treasonable and disunion speech which Lincoln had made here on the 16th of June. Now, I do suppose the Judge really spent some time in New York maturing the plan of the campaign, as his friends heralded for him. I have been able, by noting his movements since his arrival in Illinois, to discover evidences confirmatory of that allegation. I think I have been able to see what are the material points of that plan. I will, for a little while, ask your attention to some of them.

What I shall point out, though not showing the whole plan, are, nevertheless, the main points, as I suppose.

They are not very numerous. The first is Popular Sovereignty. The second and third are attacks upon my speech made on the 16th of June. Out of these three points—drawing within the range of popular sovereignty the question of the Lecompton Constitution—he makes his principal assault. Upon these his successive speeches are substantially one and the same. On this matter of popular sovereignty I wish to be a little careful. Auxiliary to these main points, to be sure, are their thunderings of cannon, their marching and music, their fizzle-gigs and fire-works; but I will not waste time with them. They are but the little trappings of the campaign.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

Coming to the substance—the first point—“popular sovereignty.” It is to be labeled upon the cars in which he travels; put upon the hacks he rides in; to be flaunted upon the arches he passes under, and the banners which wave over him. It is to be dished up in as many varieties as a French cook can produce soups from potatoes. Now, as this is so great a staple of the plan of the campaign, it is worth while to examine it carefully; and if we examine only a very little, and do not allow ourselves to be misled, we shall be able to see that the whole thing is the most arrant Quixotism that was ever enacted before a community. What is this matter of popular sovereignty? The first thing, in order to understand it, is to get a good definition of what it is, and after that to see how it is applied.

I suppose almost every one knows, that in this controversy, whatever has been said has had reference to the question of negro slavery. We have not been in a controversy about the right of the people to govern themselves in the *ordinary* matters of domestic concern in the States and Territories. Mr. Buchanan, in one of his late messages (I think when he sent up the Lecompton Constitution), urged that the main point to which the public attention had been directed, was not in regard to the great variety of small domestic matters, but it was directed to the question of negro slavery; and he asserts, that if the people had had a fair chance to vote on that question, there was no reasonable ground of objection in regard to minor questions. Now, while I think that the people had *not* had given, or offered them, a fair chance upon that slavery question; still, if there had been a fair submission to a vote upon that main question, the President's proposition would have been true to the uttermost. Hence, when hereafter I speak

of popular sovereignty, I wish to be understood as applying what I say to the question of slavery only, not to other minor domestic matters of a Territory or a State.

Does Judge Douglas, when he says that several of the past years of his life have been devoted to the question of "popular sovereignty," and that all the remainder of his life shall be devoted to it, does he mean to say that he has been devoting his life to securing to the people of the Territories, the right to exclude slavery from the Territories? If he means so to say, he means to deceive; because he and every one knows that the decision of the Supreme Court, which he approves and makes an especial ground of attack upon me for disapproving, forbids the people of a Territory to exclude slavery. This covers the whole ground, from the settlement of a Territory till it reaches the degree of maturity entitling it to form a State Constitution. So far as all that ground is concerned, the Judge is not sustaining popular sovereignty, but absolutely opposing it. He sustains the decision which declares that the popular will of the Territories has no Constitutional power to exclude slavery during their Territorial existence. [Cheers.] This being so, the period of time, from the first settlement of a Territory till it reaches the point of forming a State Constitution, is not the thing that the Judge has fought for, or is fighting for, but on the contrary, he has fought for, and is fighting for, the thing that annihilates and crushes out that same popular sovereignty.

Well, so much being disposed of, what is left? Why, he is contending for the right of the people, when they come to make a State Constitution, to make it for themselves, and precisely as best suits themselves. I say again, that is Quixotic. I defy contradiction, when I declare that the Judge can find no one to oppose him on that proposition. I repeat, there is nobody opposing that proposition on *principle*. Let me not be misunderstood. I know that, with reference to the Lecompton Constitution, I may be misunderstood; but when you understand me correctly, my proposition will be true and accurate. Nobody is opposing, or has opposed, the right of the people, when they form a Constitution, to form it for themselves. Mr. Buchanan and his friends have not done it; they, too, as well as the Republicans and the Anti-Lecompton Democrats, have not done it; but, on the contrary, they together have insisted on the right of the people to form a Constitution for themselves. The difference between the Buchanan men, on the one hand, and the Douglas men and the Republicans on the other, has not been on a question of principle, but on a question of *fact*.

The dispute was upon the question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution had been fairly formed by the people, or not. Mr. Buchanan and his friends have not contended for the contrary principle, any more than the Douglas men or the Republicans. They have insisted, that whatever of small irregularities existed in getting up the Lecompton Constitution, were such as happen in the settlement of all new Territories. The question was, was it a fair emanation of the people? It was a question of fact, and not of principle. As to the principle, all were agreed. Judge Douglas voted with the Republicans upon that matter of fact.

He and they, by their voices and votes, denied that it was a fair emanation of the people. The Administration affirmed that it was. With respect to the evidence bearing upon that question of fact, I readily agree that Judge Douglas and the Republicans had the right on their side, and that the Administration was wrong. But I state again that, as a matter of principle, there is no dispute upon the right of a people in a Territory, merging into a State, to form a Constitution for themselves, without outside interference from any quarter. This being so, what is Judge Douglas going to spend his life for? Is he going to spend his life in maintaining a principle that nobody on earth opposes? [Cheers.] Does he expect to stand up in majestic dignity, and go through his *apotheosis*, and become a god, in the maintaining of a principle which neither man nor mouse, in all God's creation, is opposing? [Great applause.]

THE LECOMPTON ISSUE.

How will he prove that we have ever occupied a different position in regard to the Lecompton Constitution, or any principle in it? He says he did not make his opposition on the ground as to whether it was a free or a slave Constitution, and he would have you understand that the Republicans made their opposition because it ultimately became a slave Constitution. To make proof in favor of himself on this point, he reminds us that he opposed Lecompton before the vote was taken declaring whether the State was to be free or slave. But he forgets to say, that our Republican Senator, Trumbull, made a speech against Lecompton even before he did.

Why did he oppose it? Partly, as he declares, because the members of the Convention who framed it were not fairly elected by the people; that the people were not allowed to vote unless they had been registered; and that the people of whole counties, in some instances, were not registered. For these reasons he declares the Constitution was not an emanation, in

any true sense, from the people. He also has an additional objection as to the mode of submitting the Constitution back to the people. But bearing on the question of whether the delegates were fairly elected, a speech of his made something more than twelve months ago, from this stand, becomes important. It was made a little while before the election of the delegates who made Lecompton. In that speech he declared there was every reason to hope and believe the election would be fair; and if any one failed to vote it would be his own fault.

I, a few days after, made a sort of answer to that speech. In that answer, I made, substantially, the very argument with which he combated his Lecompton adversaries in the Senate last winter. I pointed to the fact that the people could not vote without being registered, and that the time for registering had gone by. I commented on it as wonderful that Judge Douglas could be ignorant of these facts, which every one else in the nation so well knew.

[Mr. Lincoln then proceeded to notice the attacks made by Douglas on the 6th of June speech of the former. In substance, it is like his reply at Chicago. Some of its more striking passages are here subjoined.]

He charges, in substance, that I invite a war of sections; that I propose that all the local institutions of the different States shall become consolidated and uniform. What is there in the language of that speech which expresses such purpose, or bears such construction? I have again and again said that I would not enter into any of the States to disturb the institution of slavery. Judge Douglas said, at Bloomington, that I used language most able and ingenious for concealing what I really meant; and that, while I had protested against entering into the slave States, I nevertheless did mean to go on the banks of the Ohio and throw missiles into Kentucky, to disturb the people there in their domestic institutions.

I said in that speech, and I meant no more, that the institution of slavery ought to be placed in the very attitude where the framers of this Government placed it, and left it. I do not understand that the framers of our Constitution left the people of the free States in the attitude of firing bombs or shells into the slave States. I was not using that passage for the purpose for which he infers I did use it. * * * Now you all see, from that quotation, I did not express my *wish* on anything. In that passage I indicated no wish or purpose of my own; I simply expressed my *expectation*.

[Further on, Mr. Lincoln said :]

Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, in one of his speeches, when they were presenting him canes, silver plate, gold pitchers and the like, for assailing Senator Sumner, distinctly affirmed his opinion that when this Constitution was formed, it was the belief of no man that slavery would last to the present day.

He said, what I think, that the framers of our Constitution placed the institution of slavery where the public mind rested in the hope that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. But he went on to say that the men of the present age, by their experience, have become wiser than the framers of the Constitution; and the invention of the cotton-gin had made the perpetuity of slavery a necessity in this country.

[Recurring to the Dred Scott case, after citing Jefferson's views on judicial decisions, and alluding to the course of the Democracy, Douglas included, in regard to the National Bank decision, Mr. Lincoln said :]

Now, I wish to know what the Judge can charge upon me, with respect to decisions of the Supreme Court, which does not lie in all its length, breadth and proportions at his own door. The plain truth is simply this: Judge Douglas is *for* Supreme Court decisions when he likes and against them when he does not like them. He is for the Dred Scott decision because it tends to nationalize slavery—because it is part of the original combination for that object. It so happened, singularly enough, that I never stood opposed to a decision of the Supreme Court till this. On the contrary, I have no recollection that he was ever particularly in favor of one till this. He never was in favor of any, nor I opposed to any, till the present one, which helps to nationalize slavery.

Free men of Sangamon—free men of Illinois—free men everywhere—judge ye between him and me, upon this issue.

Near the close of July, various speeches having been made by each at different points, an arrangement for one joint discussion in each of the seven Congressional districts, in which they had not already both spoken, was agreed upon. At this stage of the canvass, the people of the whole country were beginning to take a lively interest in this contest, and the reports of the first debate at Ottawa were eagerly sought for and read, at the East and at the West. The friends of Mr. Lincoln, and the Republicans in general, were well pleased

with the manner in which he acquitted himself in this joint discussion. At each succeeding encounter of this sort, the impression was strengthened, throughout the country, that Mr. Lincoln was obtaining decided advantages over his opponent. At Freeport, he forced Douglas into an attempted reconciliation of the hitherto unexplained inconsistencies between his squatter sovereignty theory, and his support of the Dred Scott decision, which utterly excludes squatter sovereignty in practice. His "unfriendly legislation" device, on that occasion, cost Douglas the loss of the last possibility of any reconciliation with the Southern Democracy. While this answer, most unwillingly given, perhaps, yet announced with apparent alacrity, contributed something toward effecting his immediate, temporary purpose, it undoubtedly destroyed all his remoter chances as a Presidential candidate of a united Democracy.

The Ottawa debate is memorable for one of the most surprising political devices ever resorted to by a man in high position, like Douglas. It consisted in quoting a series of ultra resolutions adopted at a small local convention long before the party was formed, and palming them off as the platform adopted by "the first mass State convention ever held in Illinois by the Black Republican party." On these resolutions, to which he assumed that Lincoln was committed, Douglas based a series of questions, which the former, duly exposing the imposition thus practiced, frankly and most explicitly answered at Freeport, the scene of the second debate, as follows :

OPENING PASSAGES OF MR. LINCOLN'S FREEPORT SPEECH.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—On Saturday last, Judge Douglas and myself first met in public discussion. He spoke one hour, I an hour and a half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hour, he an hour and a half, and then I am to reply for half an hour. I propose to devote myself during the first hour to the scope of what was brought within the range of his half-hour speech at Ottawa. Of course there was brought within the scope of that half-hour's speech something of his own opening speech. In the course of that opening argument Judge Douglas proposed to me seven distinct interrogatories. In my speech of

an hour and a half, I attended to some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as I thought, answered one of the interrogatories then. I then distinctly intimated to him that I would answer the rest of his interrogatories on condition only that he should agree to answer as many for me. He made no intimation at the time of the proposition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to that suggestion of mine. I do him no injustice in saying that he occupied at least half of his reply in dealing with me as though I had *refused* to answer his interrogatories. I now propose that I will answer any of the interrogatories, upon condition that he will answer questions from me not exceeding the same number. I give him an opportunity to respond. The Judge remains silent. I now say that I will answer his interrogatories, whether he answers mine or not [applause]; and that after I have done so, I shall propound mine to him. [Applause.]

I have supposed myself, since the organization of the Republican party at Bloomington, in May, 1856, bound as a party man by the platforms of the party, then and since. If in any interrogatories which I shall answer I go beyond the scope of what is within these platforms, it will be perceived that no one is responsible but myself.

Having said thus much, I will take up the Judge's interrogatories as I find them printed in the *Chicago Times*, and answer them *seriatim*. In order that there may be no mistake about it, I have copied the interrogatories in writing, and also my answers to them. The first one of these interrogatories is in these words:

Question 1. "I desire to know whether Lincoln to-day stands, as he did in 1854, in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law?"

Answer. I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law.

Q. 2. "I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to-day, as he did in 1854, against the admission of any more slave States into the Union, even if the people want them?"

A. I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union.

Q. 3. "I want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make?"

A. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union, with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make.

Q. 4. "I want to know whether he stands to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?"

A. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

Q. 5. "I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States?"

A. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States.

Q. 6. "I desire to know whether he stands pledged to prohibit slavery in all the Territories of the United States, North as well as South of the Missouri Compromise line?"

A. I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the *right* and *duty* of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories. [Great applause.]

Q. 7. "I desire him to answer whether he is opposed to the acquisition of any new territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein?"

A. I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not agitate the slavery question among ourselves.

Now, my friends, it will be perceived upon an examination of these questions and answers, that so far I have only answered that I was not *pledged* to this, that or the other. The Judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me any thing more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not *pledged* at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them.

As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery.

In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union. I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry

ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add, that if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the Territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union. [Applause.]

The third interrogatory is answered by the answer to the second, it being, as I conceive, the same as the second.

The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. I believe that Congress possesses the Constitutional power to abolish it. Yet as a member of Congress, I should not with my present views, be in favor of *endeavoring* to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: *First*, that the abolition should be gradual; *second*, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and *third*, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, "sweep from our Capital that foul blot upon our nation."

In regard to the fifth interrogatory, I must say here, that as to the question of the abolition of the slave-trade between the different States, I can truly answer, as I have, that I am *pledged* to nothing about it. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the Constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject; but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the Constitutional power to abolish slave-trading among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power unless upon some conservative principle as I conceive it, akin to what I have said

in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all Territories of the United States, is full and explicit within itself, and can not be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing.

Now in all this, the Judge has me, and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for another place—that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be offensive to any persons and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience.

At Jonesboro, in the lower part of "Egypt," where their third debate was held, Douglas reiterated his often-refuted charges of ultraism against Lincoln, which the latter just as coolly and convincingly disposed of, as if there had been no unscrupulous pertinacity in making false accusations against him. After bringing home the sin of reopening agitation, to the door of Douglas, he proceeded to show as extravagant radicalism in the recorded professions of the Democracy as of any persons acting with the Republican party. He then completely riddled the "unfriendly legislation" theory of Douglas, exhibiting its utter inconsistency with fidelity to his Constitutional oaths, so long as he indorsed the validity of the political dogmas of Judge Taney, in his Dred Scott opinion.

In the fourth debate, at Charleston, the attempts of Douglas to make capital out of the Mexican War question were appropriately disposed of. Here, also, Douglas was convicted, on conclusive testimony, of having *stricken out* of the Toombs' Kansas Bill a clause requiring the Constitution that should be formed under its provisions, to be submitted to the people.

This had an important bearing on one objection upon which Douglas based his Anti-Lecompton rebellion.

The fifth joint discussion was held at Galesburg, the sixth at Quincy, and the last at Alton. The main topics and methods of these debates, as of the rest, did not substantially differ from those of the speeches at Chicago and Springfield.

The Alton debate occurred on the 15th of October. As the day of the election (November 2d) approached, it became more and more evident that strong efforts were making, aided by the advice of Senator Crittenden on the one hand, and of Vice President Breckinridge on the other, to secure a diversion of "Conservative" votes, American, Democratic, and Whig, in the central and southern part of the State, in favor of Douglas. These endeavors succeeded to such an extent that, with the immense advantages the Douglas party had in their unequal and utterly unfair apportionment of Legislative Districts, and in the lucky proportion of Democratic Senators holding over, they secured a small majority in each branch of the new Legislature. The Senate had 14 Democrats and 11 Republicans—the House 40 Democrats and 35 Republicans. The popular voice was for Lincoln, by *more than four thousand majority* over Douglas.

Admiration of the manly bearing and gallant conduct of Mr. Lincoln, throughout this campaign, which had early assumed a national importance, led to the spontaneous suggestion of his name, in various parts of the country, as a candidate for the Presidency. From the beginning to the end of the contest, he had proved himself an able statesman, an effective orator, a true gentleman, and an honest man. While, therefore, Douglas was returned to the Senate, there was a general presentiment, that a juster verdict was yet to be had, and that Mr. Lincoln and his cause would be ultimately vindicated before the people. That time was to come, even sooner, perhaps, than his friends, in their momentary despondency, expected. From that hour to the present, the fame of Abraham Lincoln has been enlarging and ripening, and the love of his noble character has become more and more deeply fixed in the popular heart.

CHAPTER XII.

SPEECHES OF 1859-'60.

Mr. Lincoln in Ohio.—His Speech at Columbus.—Denial of the Negro Suffrage Charge.—Troubles of Douglas with His "Great Principle."—Territories Not States.—Doctrines of the Fathers.—His Cincinnati Speech.—"Shooting Over the Line."—What the Republicans Mean to Do.—Plain Questions to the Democracy.—The People Above Courts and Congress.—Uniting the Opposition.—Eastern Tour.—The Cooper Institute Speech.—Mr. Bryant's Introduction.—What the Fathers Held.—What Will Satisfy the Southern Democracy?—Counsels to the Republicans.—Mr. Lincoln Among the Children.

DURING the year following his great contest with Douglas, which had resulted in a barren triumph through the injustice of the previous Democratic Legislature in refusing a fair and equal apportionment, Mr. Lincoln again gave himself almost exclusively to professional labors. During the autumn campaign of 1859, however, when Douglas visited Ohio, and endeavored to turn the tide of battle in favor of the Democracy in that State, so as to secure the re-election of Mr. Pugh, and to gain other partizan benefits, an earnest invitation was sent to Lincoln to assist the Republicans in their canvass. He complied, and delivered two most effective speeches in Ohio, one at Columbus, and the other at Cincinnati.

In his speech at the former place (September 16, 1859), he began by noticing a statement which he read from the central Democratic organ, averring that in the canvass of the previous year with Douglas, "Mr. Lincoln declared in favor of negro suffrage." This charge he quickly disposed of, showing by quotations from his printed speeches of that canvass, that he

distinctly and repeatedly declared himself *opposed* to the policy thus attributed to him.

Mr. Lincoln then noticed the recent Columbus speech of Mr. Douglas, in which he "dealt exclusively" in the "negro topics" of discussion. Mr. L. spoke at some length on these issues, and thoroughly exposed the distinctions between genuine popular sovereignty, and the spurious sort which Douglas and his friends pass off for the reality. He then went on to notice the great amount of trouble which Mr. Douglas has had with his spurious popular sovereignty, and to illustrate how "his explanations explanatory of explanations explained are interminable." The *Harper's Magazine* essay was dissected, and left without any logical vitality or cohesion. Two or three brief points in the remainder of this speech are subjoined :

STATES AND TERRITORIES.

There is another little difficulty about this matter of treating the Territories and States alike in all things, to which I ask your attention, and I shall leave this branch of the case. If there is no difference between them, why not make the Territories States at once? What is the reason that Kansas was not fit to come into the Union when it was organized into a Territory, in Judge Douglas's view? Can any of you tell any reason why it should not have come into the Union at once? They are fit, as he thinks, to decide upon the slavery question—the largest and most important with which they could possibly deal—what could they do by coming into the Union that they are not fit to do, according to his view, by staying out of it? Oh, they are not fit to sit in Congress and decide upon the rates of postage, or questions of *ad valorem* or specific duties on foreign goods, or live oak timber contracts. [Laughter.] They are not fit to decide these vastly important matters, which are national in their import, but they are fit, "from the jump," to decide this little negro question. But, gentlemen, the case is too plain; I occupy too much time on this head, and I pass on.

STAND BY THE DOCTRINES OF THE FATHERS.

I see in the Judge's speech here a short sentence in these words: "Our fathers, when they formed this Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and

even better than we do now." That is true. I stick to that. [Great cheers and laughter.] I will stand by Judge Douglas in that to the bitter end. [Renewed laughter.] And now, Judge Douglas, come and stand by me, and faithfully show how they acted, understanding it better than we do. All I ask of you, Judge Douglas, is to stick to the proposition that the men of the Revolution understood this subject better than we do now, *and with that better understanding they acted better than you are trying to act now.* [Applause.]

At Cincinnati, on the 17th of September, Mr. Lincoln addressed an immense audience on the same general political topics, and in his ablest manner. He did not repeat or merely play variations upon his Columbus speech, but adopted new modes of illustrating and enforcing his views. He was listened to with an interest rarely excited by any orator who ever spoke in this city, even in the most exciting campaign. No extracts can give a true idea of its ability and power as a whole. Alluding to Douglas's perversions of his views, and to the charge of wishing to disturb slavery in the States by "shooting over" the line, Mr. Lincoln said :

SHOOTING OVER THE LINE.

It has occurred to me here to-night, that if I ever do shoot over at the people on the other side of the line in a slave State, and purpose to do so, keeping my skin safe, that I have now about the best chance I shall ever have. [Laughter and applause.] I should not wonder if there are some Kentuckians about this audience; we are close to Kentucky; and whether that be so or not, we are on elevated ground, and by speaking distinctly, I should not wonder if some of the Kentuckians should hear me on the other side of the river. [Laughter.] For that reason I propose to address a portion of what I have to say to the Kentuckians.

I say, then, in the first place, to the Kentuckians, that I am what they call, as I understand it, a "Black Republican." [Applause and Laughter.] I think that slavery is wrong, morally, socially and politically. I desire that it should be no further spread in these United States, and I should not object if it should gradually terminate in the whole Union. [Applause.] While I say this for myself, I say to you, Kentuckians, that I understand that you differ radically with me upon this proposition; that you believe slavery is a good thing; that slavery is right; that it ought to be extended and

perpetuated in this Union. Now, there being this broad difference between us, I do not pretend in addressing myself to you, Kentuckians, to attempt proselyting you at all; that would be a vain effort. I do not enter upon it. I only propose to try to show you that you ought to nominate for the next Presidency, at Charleston, my distinguished friend, Judge Douglas. [Applause.] In whatever there is a difference between you and him, I understand he is as sincerely for you, and more wisely for you, than you are for yourselves. [Applause.] I will try to demonstrate that proposition. Understand now, I say that I believe he is as sincerely for you, and more wisely for you, than you are for yourselves.

Mr. Lincoln then went on to show that Douglas is constantly endeavoring to "mold the public opinion of the North to the ends" desired by the South; that he only differs from the South in so far as is necessary to retain any hold upon his own section; that not daring to maintain that slavery is right, he professes an indifference whether it is "voted up or voted down"—thus indirectly advancing the opinion that it is not wrong; and that he has taken a step in advance, by doing what would not have been thought of by any man five years ago, to-wit:—denying that the Declaration of Independence asserts any principle intended to be applicable to black men, or that properly includes them. The tendency of this charge "is to bring the public mind to the conclusion that when men are spoken of, the negro is not meant; that when negroes are spoken of, brutes alone are contemplated."

Of the certainty of a speedy Republican triumph in the nation, and of its results, Mr. Lincoln said:

WHAT THE OPPOSITION MEAN TO DO.

I will tell you, so far as I am authorized to speak for the Opposition, what we mean to do with you. We mean to treat you, as nearly as we possibly can, as Washington, Jefferson, and Madison treated you. [Cheers.] We mean to leave you alone, and in no way to interfere with your institution; to abide by all and every compromise of the Constitution. and, in a word, coming back to the original proposition, to treat you, so far as degenerated men (if we have degenerated) may, imitating the examples of those noble fathers—Wash-

ington, Jefferson and Madison. [Applause.] We mean to remember that you are as good as we; that there is no difference between us other than the difference of circumstances. We mean to recognise and bear in mind always that you have as good hearts in your bosoms as other people, or as we claim to have, and treat you accordingly. We mean to marry your girls when we have a chance—the white ones I mean—[laughter] and I have the honor to inform you that I once did get a chance in that way. [A voice, “Good for you,” and applause.]

PLAIN QUESTIONS TO THE DISUNION DEMOCRACY.

I have told you what we mean to do. I want to know, now, when that thing takes place, what you mean to do. I often hear it intimated that you mean to divide the Union whenever a Republican, or anything like it, is elected President of the United States. [A voice, “That is so.”] “That is so,” one of them says. I wonder if he is a Kentuckian? [A voice, “He is a Douglas man.”] Well, then, I want to know what you are going to do with your half of it? [Applause and laughter.] Are you going to split the Ohio down through, and push your half off a piece? Or are you going to keep it right alongside of us outrageous fellows? Or are you going to build up a wall someway between your country and ours, by which that movable property of yours can’t come over here any more, and you lose it? Do you think you can better yourselves on that subject, by leaving us here under no obligation whatever to return those specimens of your movable property that come hither? You have divided the Union because we would not do right with you, as you think, upon that subject; when we cease to be under obligations to do anything for you, how much better off do you think you will be? Will you make war upon us and kill us all? Why, gentlemen, I think you are as gallant and as brave men as live; that you can fight as bravely in a good cause, man for man, as any other people living; that you have shown yourselves capable of this upon various occasions; but, man for man, you are not better than we are, and there are not so many of you as there are of us. [Loud cheering.] You will never make much of a hand at whipping us. If we were fewer in numbers than you, I think that you could whip us; if we were equal it would likely be a drawn battle; but being inferior in numbers, you will make nothing by attempting to master us.

WHAT REPUBLICANS MUST DO.

I say that we must not interfere with the institution of Slavery in the States where it exists, because the Constitution

forbids it, and the general welfare does not require us to do so. We must not withhold an efficient fugitive slave law, because the Constitution requires us, as I understand it, not to withhold such a law, but we must prevent the outspreading of the institution, because neither the Constitution nor the general welfare requires us to extend it. We must prevent the revival of the African slave-trade and the enacting by Congress of a Territorial slave-code. We must prevent each of these things being done by either Congresses or Courts. THE PEOPLE OF THESE UNITED STATES ARE THE RIGHTFUL MASTERS OF BOTH CONGRESSES AND COURTS [applause], not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert that Constitution. [Applause.]

After expressing an earnest desire "that all the elements of the Opposition should unite in the next Presidential election and in all future time," on a right and just basis; and after saying, "There are plenty of men in the slave States that are altogether good enough for me to be either President or Vice President, provided they will profess sympathy with our purpose in the election, and will place themselves upon such ground that our men, upon principle, can vote for them," Mr. Lincoln brought his remarks to a close.

In the spring of 1860, Mr. Lincoln yielded to the calls which came to him from the East for his presence and aid in the exciting political canvasses there going on. He spoke at various places in Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, and also in New York city, to very large audiences, and was everywhere warmly welcomed. Perhaps one of the greatest speeches of his life, was that delivered by him at the Cooper Institute, in New York, on the 27th of February, 1860. A crowded audience was present, which received Mr. Lincoln with enthusiastic demonstrations. William Cullen Bryant presided, and introduced the speaker in terms of high compliment to the West, and to the "eminent citizen" of that section, whose political labors in 1856 and '58 were appropriately eulogized.

THE COOPER INSTITUTE SPEECH.

Mr. Lincoln then proceeded to address his auditors in an extended and closely-reasoned argument, proving in the most convincing manner, that the Republican party stands where

"the Fathers" stood on the slavery question, and eloquently enforcing the sentiment expressed by Mr. Douglas in his Columbus speech, of the previous autumn, namely: "Our fathers, when they framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now." The argument and its illustrations were masterly; the logic unanswerable. A few paragraphs of his concluding remarks are all that can be given here:

WHAT WILL SATISFY THE SOUTHERN DEMOCRACY?

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them, if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them.

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know, because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, What will satisfy them? Simply this: We must not only let them alone, but we must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them, from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches, we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact, that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery *wrong*, and join them in calling it *right*. All this must be done thoroughly—done in *acts* as well as in *words*. * * *

If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of

those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man—such as a policy of “don’t care” on a question about which all true men do care—such as Union appeals, beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the Divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance—such as invocations of Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said, and undo what Washington did. Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it.

This is the last of the great speeches of Mr. Lincoln, of which there is any complete report. It forms a brilliant close to this period of his life, and a fitting prelude to that on which he is believed to be about to enter.

It was during this visit to New York that the following incident occurred, as related by a teacher in the Five-Points House of Industry, in that city:

Our Sunday-school in the Five Points was assembled, one Sabbath morning, a few months since, when I noticed a tall, and remarkable-looking man enter the room and take a seat among us. He listened with fixed attention to our exercises, and his countenance manifested such genuine interest, that I approached him and suggested that he might be willing to say something to the children. He accepted the invitation with evident pleasure, and coming forward began a simple address, which at once fascinated every little hearer, and hushed the room into silence. His language was strikingly beautiful, and his tones musical with intensest feeling. The little faces around would droop into sad conviction as he uttered sentences of warning, and would brighten into sunshine as he spoke cheerful words of promise. Once or twice he attempted to close his remarks, but the imperative shout of “Go on!” “Oh, do go on!” would compel him to resume. As I looked upon the gaunt and sinewy frame of the stranger, and marked his powerful head and determined features, now touched into softness by the impressions of the moment, I felt an irrepressible curiosity to learn something more about him, and when he was quietly leaving the room, I begged to know his name. He courteously replied, “It is Abram Lincoln, from Illinois!”

CHAPTER XIII.

MR. LINCOLN'S NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY.—
CONCLUSION.

The Republican National Convention at Chicago.—The Charleston Explosion.—“Constitutional Union” Nominations.—Distinguished Candidates among the Republicans.—The Platform.—The Ballotings.—Mr. Lincoln Nominated.—Unparalleled Enthusiasm.—The Ticket Completed with the name of Senator Hamlin.—Its Reception by the Country.—Mr. Lincoln's Letter of Acceptance.

THE doings of the Republican National Convention, which met at Chicago on the 16th of May, 1860, are too fresh in public recollection to be recapitulated or dwelt upon here. At the date of its assembling, the great quadrennial convention of the Democratic party had been held at Charleston, and, after nearly two weeks' session, had adjourned without any agreement upon either platform or candidates. Douglas, with his Freeport record, which had become necessary in order to accomplish his temporary purpose, had proved an irreconcilably disturbing element in that convention. The nomination of Douglas by a united Democracy had been demonstrated to be impossible, and the only alternative of his withdrawal or an incurable disruption was presented. Subsequently, a “Constitutional Union” Convention had assembled at Baltimore and nominated a Presidential ticket, with no other definitely avowed object than that professed in common by all citizens, everywhere, of supporting the Constitution and the Union. All eyes were now turned toward Chicago, as the point at which the problem of the next Presidency was to be definitely solved.

Before the Republican National Convention met, the names

of many distinguished statesmen had been proposed for the first place on the Presidential ticket, and their merits and availability had been extensively discussed. In this preliminary canvassing there had been no bitterness or unseemly personalities. There was a general indication of harmony in ultimate action, and of unbroken union upon whatever ticket should be selected.

The first day of the convention was spent in organizing, and on the second day the committee, selected for that purpose, reported a platform of principles which was unanimously adopted, and has been strongly approved by the people.

On the morning of the 18th, amid the most intense though subdued excitement of the twelve thousand people inside of the "Wigwam" in which the convention was held, and amid the anxious solicitude and suspense of the still greater numbers outside who could not gain admission, it was voted to proceed at once to ballot for a candidate for President of the United States. Seven names were formally presented in the following order :

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, of New York ; ABRAHAM LINCOLN, of Illinois ; WILLIAM L. DAYTON, of New Jersey ; SIMON CAMERON, of Pennsylvania ; SALMON P. CHASE, of Ohio ; EDWARD BATES, of Missouri ; and JOHN MCLEAN, of Ohio.

Loud and long-continued applause greeted the first two of these names, in particular, between which it was soon apparent that the chief contest was to be.

On the first ballot Mr. Seward received 173 votes, Mr. Lincoln 102, Mr. Cameron 50, Mr. Chase 49, Mr. Bates 48, Mr. Dayton 14, Mr. McLean 12, and there were 16 votes scattered among candidates not put in nomination. For a choice, 233 votes were required.

On the second ballot (Mr. Cameron's name having been withdrawn) the vote for the several candidates was as follows : Mr. Seward 184, Mr. Lincoln 181, Mr. Chase 42, Mr. Bates 35, Mr. Dayton 10, Mr. McLean 8, scattering 4.

The third ballot was immediately taken, and, when the call of the roll was ended, the footings were as follows : For Mr. Lincoln 231, Mr. Seward 180, Mr. Chase 24, Mr. Bates 22,

all others 7. Immediately, before the result was announced, four Ohio delegates changed their votes to Mr. Lincoln, giving him a majority.

The scene which followed—the wild manifestations of approval and delight, within and without the hall, prolonged uninterruptedly for twenty minutes, and renewed again and again for a half-hour longer—no words can describe. Never before was there a popular assembly of any sort, probably, so stirred with a contagious and all-pervading enthusiasm. The nomination was made unanimous, on motion of Mr. Everts, of New York, who had presented the name of Mr. Seward, and speedily, on the wings of lightning, the news of the great event was spread to all parts of the land. Subsequently, with like heartiness and unanimity, the ticket was completed by the nomination, on the second ballot, of Senator HANNIBAL HAMLIN, of Maine, for Vice-President.

These remarkable and unparalleled demonstrations at Chicago were but a representation of the common sentiments of the masses of the Republican party, and of thousands among the people, not before included in its ranks, in the country at large. From that day to the present, the wisdom of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln for the highest place in the American Government has been more and more confirmed. As a man of the people, in cordial sympathy with the masses, he will secure an immense vote from the sincere friends of free labor, regardless of party distinctions. As a man of sterling integrity and incorruptible honesty, he is felt to be a suitable agent for rescuing the federal government from its present degradations. As a man of undoubted ability, and of sound principles after the earliest and best standards in our political history, his election will bring quiet to the country, and insure an administration that shall be eminently creditable to our republican polity.

The brief and admirable letter of Mr. Lincoln, in acceptance of the Presidential nomination, marking the transition to a new period of his life but now beginning, forms the appropriate conclusion to the present work :

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., May 23, 1860.

HON. GEO. ASHMUN,

President of the Republican National Convention:

SIR:—I accept the nomination tendered me by the convention over which you presided, and of which I am formally apprised in the letter of yourself and others, acting as a committee of the convention for that purpose.

The declaration of principles and sentiments, which accompanies your letter, meets my approval; and it shall be my care not to violate, nor disregard it, in any part.

Imploring the assistance of Divine Providence, and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the convention; to the rights of all the States, and Territories, and the people of the nation; to the inviolability of the Constitution, and to the perpetual union, harmony and prosperity of all, I am most happy to co-operate for the practical success of the principles declared by the convention.

Your obliged friend and fellow-citizen,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

SKETCH

OF THE

LIFE OF HANNIBAL HAMLIN.

THE ANCESTORS of Mr. Hamlin were among the earlier settlers of Massachusetts. His grandfather, Eleazer Hamlin, resided in that State. Immediately before the Revolution, when companies of minute men were raised, he commanded one, and had five sons enrolled under him. Of these, one served during the war, and was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati. Cyrus, another son of Eleazer Hamlin, studied medicine, and settled as a physician at Livermore, Oxford county, Maine, in the valley of the Androscoggin. He was here married to Anna Livermore, daughter of Deacon Elijah Livermore, one of the principal proprietors of the town which bears his name.

Dr. Hamlin pursued his profession at this place for several years, having a very extensive practice. While residing at Livermore, he built the house in which the three Washburnes, now Representatives in Congress, were born. On the division of the old county of Cumberland, and the formation of Oxford county, he was appointed Clerk of the Courts for the latter, which office he long retained. He was afterward Sheriff of the county for a number of years, and until his resignation of the office. On receiving the first of these appointments, he of course removed to the county seat, Paris. Dr. Hamlin was a member of the Baptist church for many years previous to his death, which occurred in 1828, when he was fifty-eight years of age. He was universally respected as a Christian man. His widow, a member of the same



Mr. Dalton, Stroud & Co.

H. Hauke

church, and eminent for her piety, survived him until 1851, being seventy years old at the time of her decease.

HANNIBAL HAMLIN was born of these parents, in Paris, Maine, on the 27th day of August, 1809—in the same year with Abraham Lincoln, of whom he is six months the junior. There were seven children in the family, six of them being sons, of whom Hannibal was the youngest. His oldest brother, Elijah, has long been one of the most prominent men of the State. It was the design of Dr. Hamlin to give his son Hannibal a collegiate education, and he was early sent to the private schools in his own town, and to the Academy in Hebron, not far distant. At about fifteen or sixteen years of age, he was nearly fitted for college, when the failure of the health of his brother Cyrus, who was to have remained at home on the farm, led to the recall of Hannibal from school, to engage in farm-work, while Cyrus went to the study of medicine.

During this time of his laboring on the farm, Hannibal completed the survey of a township of forest land, purchased by his father and others. This tract was situated on the Dead river, about twelve miles distant from any inhabitants. Young Hamlin entered the woods about the first of April, on snow shoes, he and his party carrying their provisions and supplies on their backs. They remained in the woods nearly six weeks, often sleeping on the ground, in the gorges and on the mountains, with the snow seven feet in depth beneath them. He continued his agricultural labors until he was about eighteen years old, when, under the direction of his father, he began the study of the law with his brother Elijah, who had settled in the Eastern part of Maine. He studied six or eight months, when, his father dying, he again returned home, and labored on the farm for the next two years.

Early in the spring of 1829 or '30, he purchased one-half of the *Jeffersonian*, a paper printed in Paris. His associate in the proprietorship was Horatio King, the present First Assistant Postmaster-General. While connected with this paper, and after leaving it, he contributed both prose and poetic articles to its columns. He sold out his interest in the

paper to Mr. King, in the fall of the same year, but continued to work at the case and at the press until the January following.

Acting under the advice of his mother, he then returned to the study of the law, entering the office of Joseph G. Cole, who was afterward a Judge of the District Court of Maine. During the next three years his legal studies were prosecuted with Mr. Cole, and also with the firm of Messrs. Fessenden, Deblois and Fessenden, of Portland, the junior partner of this firm being his present colleague in the United States Senate.

After completing this the required term of study, Mr. Hamlin was admitted to the bar at Paris, in January, 1833, and at once entered on the practice of his profession, having been engaged in a case, argued it before a jury, and gained a verdict on the day of his admission. The client in this case was so well pleased with the young advocate, that he named a son after him—now a distinguished mechanic in Massachusetts.

In April, 1833, Mr. Hamlin removed to Hampden, a town of about 4,000 inhabitants, with a village of 1,500, situated six miles below the city of Bangor, on the west bank of the Penobscot river, where he has ever since resided. Here he at once entered upon a large practice, always arguing his own cases, and being often employed to argue those of other counselors. In addition to his forensic efforts, he frequently addressed public audiences at lyceums and in political and other meetings. His extensive legal practice was continued until the time of his second election to the Senate, in 1851, when he wholly abandoned his professional pursuits.

In 1833, Mr. Hamlin was married to Miss Sarah Jane Emery, daughter of the Hon. Stephen Emery, the Judge of Probate for the county of Oxford, and afterward Attorney General for the State and Judge of the District. He still survives. Mrs. Hamlin died in April, 1855, leaving three children, two sons and one daughter. One of these sons was present at the recent State Convention of the Republicans of Maine, at Augusta, and made a speech which was received with great applause. In September, 1856, Mr. Hamlin was married to

Miss Ellen V. Emery, his present accomplished wife, by whom he has one son. She is a half-sister of his former wife.

Mr. Hamlin was annually elected by his fellow-townsmen of Hampden, a Representative in the State Legislature, during the five years from 1836 to 1840, inclusive. He became at once a prominent member of the House, and one of the leaders of his party, being one of the foremost participants in all the principal debates. He was one of the most active business men in that body. The second year of his service, 1837, he was elected Speaker of the House, and was again elected to that office in 1839 and '40. At the close of each session, during which he occupied the Chair, he received a cordial and unanimous vote of thanks for the ability and impartiality with which he had discharged the duties of that position.

In 1840, Mr. Hamlin was the candidate of the Democratic party (of which he had always been an active and efficient member) for Representative in Congress from the Penobscot district. This was in the midst of the Harrison tornado, which overturned the Democratic ascendancy in Maine, for the time, as in so many other States. He was defeated in a poll of about fifteen thousand votes, by less than two hundred. It is noticeable that in this campaign he canvassed the district with his opponent, the Hon. Elisha H. Allen, this being, it is believed, the first instance of the kind in New England. In 1843 (the election having been postponed one year, in consequence of the required new apportionment under the census), Mr. Hamlin was again a candidate, running against Mr. Allen, his former competitor, and was elected by about one thousand majority.

Mr. Hamlin first took a seat in the National House of Representatives at the opening of the 28th Congress, in December, 1843. He was appointed a member of the Committee on Elections. His first speech (reported in the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe*, 13th vol., p. 28) was in opposition to the 21st rule. He also spoke, at the first session, on a bill fixing the time for the meeting of Presidential electors, and delivered a political speech on party issues (April 15, 1844),

the Presidential contest between Clay and Polk being then pending.

The second session of the 28th Congress was memorable for the consummation of the annexation of Texas. Mr. Hamlin was not averse to new accessions of territory, but favored that policy, on such terms as he deemed suitable. The joint resolution annexing Texas did not meet his approval, and he voted against it. On that subject he made a sound and truly eloquent speech. He expressed his profound regret that this "great and important national question had been dragged down, down, down, from its own proper sphere to a wretched, contemptible one for extending and perpetuating slavery." The attempt "had been made, by certain gentlemen, to degrade it from its nationality into a question for promoting one narrow, sectional interest—the strengthening of the slave power." He then entered into an examination of the correspondence of the Tyler Administration on the subject, showing what pro-slavery motives had entered into its policy on this question, and how prominently the "alleged design of the British Government to abolish slavery in Texas," had been brought to bear upon the annexation issue. After quoting from an elaborate argument of Mr. CALHOUN, then Secretary of State, in defense of slavery, and urging the annexation of Texas, as a means for its maintenance, Mr. Hamlin said :

What! was it true that the slave institution in this country was the great upholder of the power of this Republic, and the great means of spreading civilization over the world? Was it on such a correspondence and on such doctrine that gentlemen of that House were solicited to vote in the affirmative and to consummate this Union between Texas and the United States? When this correspondence was given to the world and they should return home and tell their constituents that they had voted for annexation on such principles and with such an aim, would they not be pronounced recreant to their duty and traitors to their country? Mr. H. denied this reasoning and the conclusions. If Government were thus bound to extend its domain for such a purpose, *it made what was entirely a domestic affair one of a national character.* The General Government had no right to interfere in it. If it could *extend* for a supposed beneficial purpose, it could

restrict, if it believed it would produce the same beneficial effect. It was an attempt to make a national question of what related solely to the States; and those who assumed to give it that character would be swift indeed to prevent the action of Congress in another and different direction. The question of annexation was fully and clearly national—not one where Government should act for a cause over which it had no right to interfere.

After further pursuing this branch of his subject, Mr. Hamlin expressed his friendliness to annexation on fair and equal terms, but his opposition to the present measure. He then alluded to reproaches which had been uttered against his section of the country, concluding as follows :

If the North had acted wickedly, he offered for her no apology—that wickedness was not the crime of her *people*, it belonged to her politicians alone. Mr. H. had neither reproaches to cast, nor defense to offer for the folly or wickedness, which, at times, had been committed by political men. Sure he was, that the hardy sons of the ice-bound region of New England had poured out their blood without stint to protect the shores of the South, or to avenge her wrongs. Their bones were even now bleaching beneath the sun on many a Southern hill; and the monuments of their brave devotion, might still be traced wherever their country's flag had floated on the battle-field or the breeze, upon the lakes, the ocean, and the land.

“New England's dead! New England's dead!
 On every field they lie,
 On every field of strife made red,
 With bloody victory!
 Their bones are on our Northern hills,
 And on the Southern plain;
 By brook and river, mount and rills,
 And in the sounding main.”

I glory in New England and New England's institutions. There she stands, with her free schools and her free labor, her fearless enterprise, her indomitable energy! With her rocky hills, her torrent streams, her green valleys, her heavenward pointed spires; there she stands, a moral monument, around which the gratitude of her country binds the wreath of fame, while protected Freedom shall repose forever at its base.

I meet not my Southern brethren with the brand of dis-

cord, but with the olive branch of peace. I meet them in the spirit of harmony. I desire to meet them on even ground, on ground alike respectful to the North and to the South; and I invoke them to perform this great national act in such a manner that Southern and Northern hands may unite in raising the stars and stripes of our beloved Union, and that Southern and Northern hearts may rejoice together to behold them floating forever over the rich and fertile Texan plains. I ask—will not gentlemen meet us here? Will they not rescue this measure alike from danger and reproach, and put it in a shape to gratify us all? I entreat them to look at the question in all the lights of cool reflection, before they finally reject a compromise which, while it secures them an inestimable benefit, does equal justice to all sections, and all interests of the Union.

It is hardly necessary now to say that Mr. Hamlin's appeal on this subject was of no immediate practical avail, and that he voted against the Annexation resolution. At the same session, Mr. Hamlin delivered a practical speech (*App. Globe*, vol. 14, p. 248) on a reduction and graduation of the price of the public lands.

Mr. Hamlin was again elected to the House of Representatives in 1844. He was Chairman of the Committee on Elections, and a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, during the 29th Congress. He made several speeches the first session, on the public land question, on giving notice to the British Government to terminate the joint occupancy of Oregon (Jan. 12, 1846), on the mode of raising troops for the Mexican War, and other subjects. At the second session, 1846-7, he spoke on the mode of increasing the army, and on establishing a Territorial Government for Oregon. In this latter speech, Mr. Hamlin (dissenting from the policy of the Democratic party in general) more distinctly explained his position in regard to the annexation of Texas, after the refusal of the South to agree to any division of the territory between slavery and free labor. He here announced, in the most explicit manner, his opposition to the extension of slavery, as already foreshadowed in his first speech on Texan annexation, when that measure was still pending. During this session, he offered the Wilmot Proviso, as an

amendment to the then somewhat famous "Three Million Bill."

On returning home, at the close of this Congress, there having been a failure to elect a Representative for Hampden, in the State Legislature (a majority being required to elect), Mr. Hamlin was nominated by the Democrats for that position, was elected, and served in the Legislature of 1847.

Governor Fairfield, one of the Senators of the United States from Maine, having died in the spring of 1848, Mr. Hamlin was elected, in May of that year, to fill the vacancy thus created. He served for the four years of this unexpired term, and was re-elected on the 25th of July, 1851, for the full term. As a candidate, at this time, he encountered the bitter hostility of the specially pro-slavery portion of the Democracy, who refused to the last to support him, although he was the regular nominee. The exact nature of this opposition, and the method of his election, after a protracted struggle, will appear by the following extract from the columns of the *Augusta Age*, at that time the "official paper" of the Democratic party :

Hon. Hannibal Hamlin, the regular Democratic nominee for U. S. Senator, was elected in both Houses of the Legislature on Thursday last.

We congratulate the Democracy of the State upon the result. We rejoice that the question has been finally disposed of in a manner conformable to the wishes and expectations of a great majority of the Democratic party of Maine.

The failure to elect Mr. Hamlin at an earlier period in the session, was occasioned by the refusal of a small portion of the Democratic members to support him, the pretext of their opposition being the opinions he entertained upon the subject of the extension of slavery, and the determination which he cherished of obeying the resolutions of instruction passed by the last Legislature in relation to that subject.

After repeated attempts to effect an election had been made without success, several members of the Free Soil party, believing that there was an attempt on the part of the Democrats opposed to Mr. Hamlin to cut him down, in consequence of his opposition to the introduction of slavery into territory now free, although not concurring with him in political opinions, voluntarily gave him their votes, amounting to ten in the

House of Representatives, and three in the Senate, which secured his election. It was certainly an act of magnanimity, which can not fail to be appreciated, and particularly as it was a free will offering (from men who are in an opposing political organization) to Mr. Hamlin for his firm adherence to principles held in common by them with the great mass of the people of the North, irrespective of party distinctions.

In his opposition to the extension of slavery, a vital issue of the Republican organization, Mr. Hamlin has been uniform, decided and earnest during all his public career, and regardless of party ties or inducements leading in any other direction.

In the Senate, Mr. Hamlin entered at once, after his first election, upon a service as active and influential as that which distinguished his four years in the House. One of his earliest speeches, as a Senator, was on the bill providing a Territorial Government for Oregon, in 1848, during the first session of the 30th Congress. The whole subject of the then well-known Clayton Compromise came under consideration. He closed his remarks in these memorable words :

There are other objections to the bill to which I would gladly allude, but I have already detained the Senate longer than I designed or anticipated. Looking to the lights of other days—the patriots of other times—the eloquent warnings which we have had from our Washington, our Madison, our Jefferson, our Mason, ay, and from our own Pinckney, too, and all that long list of patriotic men of the South who have adorned this Union, who have pointed out the evils that would come upon us by perpetuating and extending this institution, I owe it to the constituents whom I represent, to our posterity, to all the toiling millions who are seeking an asylum in our land, to embrace this opportunity of opposing with unshaken firmness any attempt to introduce or permit this institution to flow into Territory now free. Let these vast and fertile regions be preserved for the cultivation of free labor and free men, so well calculated to advance the arts of civilization.

The first speech, properly so-called, made in the Senate on the admission of California, was delivered by Mr. Hamlin on the 5th of March, 1850.

Late in the same session, Mr. Hamlin made a speech, cred-

itable alike to his intellect and to his humanity, in favor of abolishing the practice of flogging in the navy.

As Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to which position he was elected in December, 1849, and which he continued to hold until he resigned it in 1856, Mr. Hamlin gave laborious and faithful attention to the subjects which came before him. Among his more important speeches, during the 31st Congress, were one, at the first session, on the Ocean Mail Service, and another, the second session, on regulating the liabilities of ship-owners. He took a prominent and active part, in connection with Senator John Davis, in preparing and urging the bill, first introduced in the 32nd Congress, providing for the greater security of lives on steamboats. During the first session of the same Congress, he made two elaborate speeches on the American fisheries, giving a full history of the negotiations on that subject, and furnishing a fund of information in regard to it, nowhere else to be found in the same space. He also made two or three shorter speeches, in the same Congress, defending the River and Harbor bill from the assaults made upon it, and favoring the Internal Improvement policy. He offered and actively supported an amendment of the Pension laws so as to secure pensions to widows of Revolutionary soldiers who married after 1800. He introduced a resolution, at the second session of the 32nd Congress (in 1853) authorizing the codification of the Revenue laws, which, after having been amended, on his own motion, so as to appropriate \$10,000 for this purpose, was adopted. Under Mr. Guthrie's supervision, this resolution was carried into effect, the Revenue laws codified, and reported to Congress.

At the first session of the 33rd Congress, in 1854, Mr. Hamlin proposed an amendment to the bill for the greater security of the lives of passengers on steamboats, and made a short speech, which was immediately followed by the passage of that most important bill, in the Senate.

Down to 1856, Mr. Hamlin had acted regularly with the Democratic party, uniformly voting, nevertheless, against all projects for extending slavery. Having occupied, for several

years, the position of Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to which he was appointed by the Democratic majority in the Senate, he felt it to be his duty to resign that place, on resolving, after the Cincinnati Convention of 1856, no longer to act with a party which he deemed to have deserted the chief landmarks of Democracy. In doing so he took occasion to define his political position, in a clear and apposite speech herewith given :

MR. HAMLIN'S SPEECH ON DEMOCRATIC TESTS.

(In the United States Senate, June 12, 1856.)

The Senate having come to order, Mr. Hamlin said :

MR. PRESIDENT :—I rise for a purpose purely personal, such as I have never before risen for in the Senate. I desire to explain some matters personal to myself and to my own future course in public life.

Several Senators. Go on.

Mr. Hamlin. I ask the Senate to excuse me from further service as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I do so, because I feel that my relations hereafter will be of such a character as to render it proper that I should no longer hold that position. I owe this act to the dominant majority in the Senate. When I cease to harmonize with the majority, or tests are applied by that party with which I have acted to which I can not submit, I feel that I ought no longer to hold that respectable position. I propose to state briefly the reasons which have brought me to that conclusion.

During nine years of service in the Senate I have preferred rather to be a working than a talking member, and so I have been almost a silent one. On the subjects which have so much agitated the country, Senators know that I have rarely uttered a word. I love my country more than I love my party. I love my country above my love for any interest that can too deeply agitate or disturb its harmony. I saw, in all the exciting scenes and debates through which we have passed, no particular good that would result from my active intermingling in them. My heart has often been full, and the impulses of that heart have often been felt upon my lips, but I have repressed them there.

Sir, I hold that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was a gross moral and political wrong, unequaled in the annals of the legislation of this country, and hardly equaled in the annals of any other free country. Still, sir, with a desire to

promote harmony and concord and brotherly feeling, I was a quiet man under all the exciting debates which led to that fatal result. I believed it wrong then ; I can see that wrong lying broadcast all around us now. As a wrong I opposed that measure—not indeed by my voice, but with consistent and steady and uniform votes. I so resisted it in obedience to the dictates of my own judgment. I did it also cheerfully, in compliance with the instructions of the Legislature of Maine, which were passed by a vote almost unanimous. In the House of Representatives of Maine, consisting of one hundred and fifty-one members, only six, I think, dissented ; and in the Senate, consisting of thirty-one members, only one member non-concurred.

But the Missouri restriction was abrogated. The portentous evils that were predicted have followed, and are yet following, along in its train. It was done, sir, in violation of the pledges of that party with which I have always acted, and with which I have always voted. It was done in violation of solemn pledges of the President of the United States, made in his inaugural address. Still, sir, I was disposed to suffer the wrong, until I should see that no evil results were flowing from it. We were told by almost every Senator who addressed us upon that occasion, that no evil results would follow ; that no practical difference in the settlement of the country, and the character of the future State, would take place, whether the act were done or not. I have waited calmly and patiently to see the fulfillment of that prediction ; and I am grieved, sir, to say now, that they have at least been mistaken in their predictions and promises. They all have signally failed.

That Senators might have voted for that measure under the belief then expressed, and the predictions to which I have alluded, I can well understand ; but how Senators can now defend that measure amid all its evils, which are overwhelming the land, if not threatening it with a conflagration, is what I do not comprehend. The whole of the disturbed state of the country has its rise in, and is attributable to, that act alone—nothing else. It lies at the foundation of all our misfortunes and commotions. There would have been no incursions by Missouri borderers into Kansas either to establish slavery or control elections. There would have been no necessity either for others to have gone there partially to aid in preserving the country in its then condition. All would have been peace there. Had it not been done, that repose and quiet which pervaded the public mind then, would hold it in tranquillity to-day. Instead of startling events we should have quiet and peace within our borders, and that fraternal feeling

which ought to animate the citizens of every part of the Union toward those of all other sections.

Sir, the events that are taking place around us are indeed startling. They challenge the public mind, and appeal to the public judgment; they thrill the public nerve as electricity imparts a tremulous motion to the telegraphic wire. It is a period when all good men should unite in applying the proper remedy to secure peace and harmony to the country. Is this to be done by any of us, by remaining associated with those who have been instrumental in producing these results, and who now justify them? I do not see my duty lying in that direction.

I have, while temporarily acquiescing, stated here and at home, everywhere, uniformly, that when the tests of those measures were applied to me as one of party fidelity, I would sunder them as flax is sundered at the touch of fire. I do it now.

The occasion involves a question of moral duty; and self-respect allows me no other line of duty but to follow the dictates of my own judgment and the impulses of my own heart. A just man may cheerfully submit to many enforced humiliations; but a self-degraded man has ceased to be worthy to be deemed a man at all.

Sir, what has the recent Democratic Convention at Cincinnati done? It has indorsed the measure I have condemned, and has sanctioned its destructive and ruinous effects. It has done more—vastly more. That principle or policy of Territorial sovereignty which once had, and which I suppose now has, its advocates within these walls, is stricken down; and there is an absolute denial of it in the resolution of the convention—if I can draw right conclusions—a denial equally to Congress, and even to the people of the Territories, of the right to settle the question of slavery therein. On the contrary, the convention has actually incorporated into the platform of the Democratic party that doctrine which, only a few years ago, met nothing but ridicule and contempt, here and elsewhere, namely: that the flag of the Federal Union, under the Constitution of the United States, carries slavery wherever it floats. If this baleful principle be true, then that national ode, which inspires us always as on a battle-field, should be re-written by Drake, and should read thus:

“Forever float that standard sheet;
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With SLAVERY's soil beneath our feet,
And SLAVERY's banner streaming o'er us?”

Now, sir, what is the precise condition in which this matter is left by the Cincinnati Convention? I do not design to trespass many moments on the Senate; but allow me to read and offer a very few comments upon some portions of the Democratic platform. The first resolution that treats upon the subject is in these words—I read just so much of it as is applicable to my present remarks:

“That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States; and that all such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution.”

I take it that this language, thus far, is language that meets a willing and ready response from every Senator here—certainly it does from me. But in the following resolution I find these words:

“*Resolved*, That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress.”

The first resolution which I read was adopted years ago in Democratic conventions. The second resolution which I read was adopted in subsequent years, when a different state of things had arisen, and it became necessary to apply an abstract proposition relating to the States to the Territories. Hence the adoption of the language contained in the second resolution which I have read.

Now, sir, I deny the position thus assumed by the Cincinnati Convention. In the language of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), so ably and so appropriately used, on Tuesday last, I hold that the entire and unqualified sovereignty of the Territories is in Congress. That is my judgment; but this resolution brings the Territories precisely within the same limitations which are applied to the States in the resolution which I first read. The two taken together deny to Congress any power of legislation in the Territories.

Follow on, and let us see what remains. Adopted as a part of the present platform, and as necessary to a new state of things, and to meet an emergency now existing, the convention says:

“The American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the slavery question, upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose, in its determined conservatism of the Union—non-interference by Congress with slavery in States and Territories.”

Then follows the last resolution :

"*Resolved*, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the fairly-expressed will of the majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Take all these resolutions together, and the deduction which we must necessarily draw from them is a denial to Congress of any power whatever to legislate upon the subject of slavery. The last resolution denies to the people of the Territory any power over that subject, save when they shall have a sufficient number to form a Constitution and become a State, and also denies that Congress has any power over the subject; and so the resolutions hold that this power is at least in abeyance while the Territory is in a Territorial condition. That is the only conclusion which you can draw from these resolutions. Alas! for short-lived Territorial sovereignty. It came to its death in the house of its friends; it was buried by the same hands which had given it baptism!

But, sir, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing these resolutions, but only to read them, and state the action which I propose to take in view of them. I may—I probably shall—take some subsequent occasion, when I shall endeavor to present to the Senate and the country a fair account of what is the true issue presented to the people for their consideration and decision.

My object now is to show only that the Cincinnati Convention has indorsed and approved of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, from which so many evils have already flowed—from which, I fear, more and worse evils must yet be anticipated. It would, of course, be expected that the Presidential nominee of that Convention would accept, cordially and cheerfully, the platform prepared for him by his party friends. No person can object to that. There is no equivocation on his part about the matter. I beg leave to read a short extract from a speech of that gentleman, made at his own home, within the last few days. In reply to the Keystone Club, which paid him a visit there, Mr. Buchanan said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made you a longer speech, but now I have been placed on a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct

according to the platform of the party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it."

These events leave to me only one unpleasant duty, which is to declare here that I can maintain political associations with no party that insists upon such doctrines; that I can support no man for President who avows and recognizes them; and that the little of that power with which God has endowed me shall be employed to battle manfully, firmly, and consistently for his defeat, demanded as it is by the highest interests of the country which owns all my allegiance.

Mr. Hamlin was subsequently nominated, in June, 1856, as the Republican candidate for Governor of Maine. The Democratic party had carried the State the year previous, and were then in power. He commenced the canvass in July, and traversed the State, making nearly a hundred speeches in the different counties. He was elected in September by an absolute majority of about eighteen thousand over his two competitors, and twenty-three thousand over the Democratic candidate, more than double the majority ever given to any other candidate in that State. The effect of this brilliant triumph was electric, in the great Fremont canvass, and so remarkable a revolution surprised even the most sanguine of Senator Hamlin's friends abroad.

On the 7th of January, 1857, he resigned his seat in the Senate, and was inaugurated the same day as Governor of Maine.

On the 16th of January, a little more than a week after his inauguration, Gov. Hamlin was, for the third time, chosen a Senator of the United States, in which office he had served nearly ten years. The full term, for which he was then elected, commenced on the 4th of March, 1857. On the 20th of February he resigned the office of Governor, and soon after returned to Washington, resuming his seat in the Senate.

During the first session of the 35th Congress, March 9th and 10th, 1858, Mr. Hamlin made an extended and able speech on the Lecompton Constitution and the Kansas question. He also replied at the same session, pointedly and eloquently, to the "mud-sill" speech of Gov. Hammond, of South Carolina, repelling his assaults upon the laborers of the free

States. At the opening of this Congress, he also took occasion to expose, in a most effective manner, the unfairness and gross sectional partiality of the Democratic majority in the Senate in the formation of the committees. He made another able speech, at this session, in defense of American rights in regard to the fisheries—a question of much local importance to his own State and to other portions of New England. In the active discharge of his duties as a Senator, Mr. Hamlin, since his last election, has continued without interruption until the present time.

Mr. Hamlin's nomination for the Vice Presidency, at Chicago, on the 18th of May last, was an event as unexpected to him as any that could have happened. As a warm friend of Gov. Seward, and expecting his nomination for the Presidency, he had, of course, no thought that his own name could come before the Republican National Convention for any place on its ticket. The spontaneousness, unanimity and cordiality with which this nomination was made, and its universal acceptableness, as since demonstrated, are conclusive evidences of the exalted character and eminently honorable national standing of Senator Hamlin. He is also emphatically one who has a strong hold upon the popular heart. His sympathies are with the people, and he shares theirs in return. No other name could have been found among all those of our public men, which, as associated with that of Abraham Lincoln, could bring more strength to the ticket in the present canvass.

Little remains to be added to this condensed sketch, save some more particular notice of Mr. Hamlin's public character and personal traits. It is but stating the strict truth to say that, during his entire Congressional service, Mr. Hamlin has displayed, in an eminent degree, the qualities of a prompt, intelligent and efficient business man. His executive abilities are of a rare and high order. He has made it a first object to meet the business demands made upon him by his own constituents and State. Every letter, of this sort, is promptly attended to and answered. What a draft this has constantly made upon his time and efforts, every man who

knows anything of the requirements made of a Congressman, will be able to appreciate. All parties in Maine have demanded these services from Mr. Hamlin, and have accorded him the praise of fidelity and efficiency in devotion to their interests. The heads of the Treasury and of the Customs Department, including such men as ex-Secretary Guthrie, Assistant and Acting Secretary Hodge, and Gov. Anderson, Commissioner of Customs, have declared Gov. Hamlin to be the best business man in the Senate. During his entire service as a Senator, he has been a member of the very laborious and important Committee on Commerce, and was its Chairman for seven years. In this latter capacity, he had supervision of all the great questions and measures affecting the commerce of the country, both domestic and foreign, acted upon by that committee, no bill being reported which he had not fully understood by personal investigation.

Among the important measures instituted and reported by that committee, were those relating to the improvement of harbors, rivers, and lakes, the whole system of light-houses, the protection of passengers on steam and sailing vessels, the location and establishment of custom-houses, the fixing of ports of entry and delivery, the measures connected with the coast-survey, and everything relating to commerce in all its ramifications. As before briefly intimated, the very important act "for the better security of the lives of passengers on board of vessels impelled in whole or in part by steam," passed in August, 1852, was reported to the Senate by Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts, but was prepared by Mr. Hamlin and Mr. Davis, jointly, and was sustained by the former in several speeches in the Senate. During all the time subsequent to the passage of the bill, while Mr. Hamlin was chairman, all the amendatory acts in relation to that subject have been reported and supported by him, and he has had in charge the bill lately passed by the House on the same subject. Certainly there is not one of the board of supervising inspectors, appointed under these laws, who will not bear testimony to the laborious investigation and practical ability displayed by Senator Hamlin in this important matter.

The bill regulating the liabilities of ship-owners was reported by Mr. Hamlin at the second session of the 31st Congress, and was carried through the Senate mainly by his efforts. This bill placed American navigation on the same footing with British navigation, and was deemed by American merchants to be of very great importance. Of so much consequence was it considered in New York, that the merchants of that city tendered him a public dinner, as a testimonial of their appreciation of his services in procuring that enactment. This honor he declined.

The codification of the revenue laws, in pursuance of a resolution introduced by him, has been previously mentioned. It was also through Mr. Hamlin's efforts that appropriations were made for the construction of the various custom-houses which have been built within the last ten years, to wit: at Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, Wheeling, Bangor, Belfast, Portsmouth, Galveston, Georgetown, Milwaukee, Norfolk, and more than twenty others in different parts of the country. It was a proviso of his, in all cases, that the cost of construction should not exceed the amount appropriated. His elaborate and able speeches on the Fishery question have been noticed, and his support to the Ocean Mail service, as auxiliary to the commerce of the country. An important report was made by him on this subject, exhibiting the commercial relations between the United States and Brazil. He has reported many bills for river and harbor improvements, and made speeches in their favor, having always been a decided friend of a general system of this kind.

In his speech on Oregon affairs, while a member of the House (before noted), he showed himself a progressive, if not a prophetic, statesman, having indicated, thus early, a Pacific railroad, and predicted the establishment of great commercial States on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

At the time of his speech in favor of a graduation in the price of the public lands (in 1846), he was not a supporter of the Homestead policy, but for several years past he has earnestly and decidedly sustained that measure. He favored the bills appropriating land in aid of agricultural colleges, and for

the benefit of the indigent insane, both of which were vetoed by Democratic Presidents.

As a party man, Mr. Hamlin voted for the Tariff of 1846, although personally in favor of specific duties. On that question he now stands with the Republican party.

Mr. Hamlin's views and record on the slavery question have been distinctly indicated. In voting against the noted "Twenty-first Rule," prohibiting the reception of Abolition petitions, at the first session of his Congressional service (in January, 1844), he was one of the earliest of Northern Democrats to take decided ground against Southern exactions. Previously, no considerable number of that party had voted against this rule; but on this occasion twenty or thirty of his Northern political associates voted with him. He voted against the annexation of Texas, after having, with forty-five others, voted for a division of the State, by a North and South line, with slavery prohibited in the Western part—a proposition made by Mr. (now Judge) Brinkerhoff, of Ohio. From that day to the present his opposition to the extension of slavery has been firm and consistent.

His connection with the famous "Wilmot Proviso" deserves to be more particularly noticed. While the bill was pending in the House, known as the Three Million Bill, appropriating that amount for the purpose of bringing the Mexican war to a close, there was a conference among certain members of the House—all Democrats—among whom were David Wilmot, Preston King, George Rathbun, Mr. Hamlin, and others, who desired that there should be a proviso added to the bill inhibiting slavery in all territory which should be acquired by virtue of the appropriation; and it was agreed that this proviso should be moved by Mr. Wilmot. The provision was printed, and notice given by that gentleman, that he should offer it. At the time when it became necessary to introduce the proviso Mr. Wilmot was absent, and Mr. Hamlin, after an ineffectual attempt by Preston King, offered the amendment which has since been known as the Wilmot Proviso. As moved by Mr. Hamlin for the first time, the proviso

was carried by a vote of 115 against 106. Among those voting in the affirmative was Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.*

As a member of the State Legislature of Maine, in 1847, Mr. Hamlin reported, from a committee of which he was chairman, a series of resolutions against the extension of slavery, and supported them in an earnest and effective speech. They were adopted in the House (numbering over one hundred and fifty members) with only six or seven votes in opposition. His subsequent speeches on this subject in the Senate, of which he became a member in May, 1857, have been particularly alluded to. That which he made on resigning his place as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, before given in full, affords a just view of his position on this question during his entire Senatorial session.

Mr. Hamlin is about six feet in height, though apparently less, in consequence of his having a slight stoop. His athletic and robust form gives a just indication of his great physical energy and power of endurance. His complexion is dark, and his eyes are of a piercing blackness. His voice is clear, strong; and melodious in its tones, and his delivery rapid, energetic, and highly effective. He speaks without verbal preparation, but without any embarrassment, and with remarkable directness. Always talking to the point, and never for mere effect, he is invariably listened to with respect and attention. As a popular orator, Mr. Hamlin has great power and eloquence. He has addressed more public assemblies, undoubtedly, than any other person of his own State. After the election in Maine, in September, 1856, the remarkable results of which, under the leadership of Mr. Hamlin, have been noticed, he spent a month in Pennsylvania and

* Mr. LINCOLN, in his Peoria speech, of 1854, thus stated his own action on the question: "In December, 1847, the new Congress assembled. I was in the lower House that term. The 'Wilmot Proviso,' or the principle of it, was constantly coming up, in some shape or other, and I think I may venture to say, I voted for it at least forty times during the single term I was there. The Senate, however, held it in check, and it never became a law."

New York, speaking almost daily. He has also rendered important and extensive service, of the same kind, in New Hampshire and Connecticut.

The manners of Mr. Hamlin, although dignified and decorous, have the elements of republican simplicity. He preserves this simplicity in his style of living, at Washington, and at his home on the Penobscot, where he cultivates his small farm with his own hands, laboring on it every summer with all the regularity and vigor of his youthful days. In his moral character, Mr. Hamlin is wholly without reproach, and in his domestic relations he is most devoted and affectionate. But perhaps the most distinguishing moral trait of Mr. Hamlin's character, is his fidelity to his friends. He never forgets a favor or a kindness, however slight. The many honors which he has received, are regarded by him not as tributes due to his individual worth, but as personal favors which demand personal gratitude. This trait of generous appreciativeness has not merely made Mr. Hamlin popular, but has caused him to be beloved as perhaps no other public man, in his own State, has ever been. He is yet in the prime and vigor of his days, not having completed his fifty-first year. He has probably a long public career before him, to which his past services are comparatively but the beginning.

Mr. Hamlin's felicitous and appropriate letter, accepting the Republican nomination for Vice-President of the United States, is here subjoined :

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1860.

GENTLEMEN:—Your official communication of the 18th instant, informing me that the representatives of the Republican party of the United States, assembled at Chicago, on that day, had, by a unanimous vote, selected me as their candidate for the office of Vice-President of the United States, has been received, together with the resolutions adopted by the Convention as its declaration of principles.

Those resolutions enunciate clearly and forcibly the principles which unite us, and the objects proposed to be accomplished. They address themselves to all, and there is neither necessity nor propriety in my entering upon a discussion of any of them. They have the approval of my judgment, and in any action of mine, will be faithfully and cordially sustained.

I am profoundly grateful to those with whom it is my pride and pleasure politically to co-operate, for the nomination so unexpectedly conferred; and I desire to tender, through you, to the members of the Convention, my sincere thanks for the confidence thus reposed in me. Should the nomination which I now accept, be ratified by the people, and the duties devolve on me of presiding over the Senate of the United States, it will be my earnest endeavor faithfully to discharge them with a just regard for the rights of all.


It is to be observed, in connection with the doings of the Republican Convention, that a paramount object with us is to preserve the normal condition of our Territorial domain, as homes for free men. The able advocate and defender of Republican principles, whom you have nominated for the highest place that can gratify the ambition of man, comes from a State which has been made what it is by special action in that respect of the wise and good men who founded our institutions. The rights of free labor have been there vindicated and maintained. The thrift and enterprise which so distinguish Illinois, one of the most flourishing States of the glorious West, we would see secured to all the Territories of the Union; and restore peace and harmony to the whole country, by bringing back the Government to what it was under the wise and patriotic men who created it. If the Republicans shall succeed in that object, as they hope to, they will be held in grateful remembrance by the busy and teeming millions of future ages.

I am, very truly, yours,

H. HAMLIN.

The Hon. GEORGE ASHMUN, President of the Convention, and others of the Committee.





EVENING COMMERCIAL.

BOSTON:

WEDNESDAY EVENING, MAY 23, 1866.

THE RETURN OF YOUTH.

Thou lookest forward to the coming days,
Shuddering to feel their shadow o'er thee creep;
A path thick set with changes and decays,
Slopes downward to the place of common sleep;
And they who walked with thee in life's first stage,
Leave, one by one, thy side, and waiting near,
Thou sceest the sad companions of thy age—
Dull love of rest, and weariness and fear.

Yet, grieve not thou, nor think thy youth is gone,
Nor deem that glorious season ere could die;
Thy pleasant youth, a little while withdrawn,
Waits on the horizon of a brighter sky;
Waits like the morn that folds her wings and hides,
Till the slow stars bring back her dawning hour;
Waits like the vanished spring, that slumbering bides
Her own sweet time to waken bud and flower.

There shall he welcome thee, when thou shalt stand
On his bright morning hills, with smiles more sweet
Than when, at first, he took thee by the hand,
Through the fair earth to lead thy tender feet.
He shall bring back, but brighter, broader still,
Life's early glory to thine eye again,
Shall clothe thy spirit with new strength, and fill
Thy leaping heart with warmer love than then.

